

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

JANUARY 1899.

No. 1.

Doctrinal Theology.

COSMOLOGY.

Cosmology, as a chapter of Christian theology, is the doctrine of Holy Scripture concerning the genesis, nature, and states, of created things. The source whence every doctrinal statement under this head must be derived is the same from which we draw our theological information concerning the unfathomable mysteries of Theology proper, the doctrine of God, of the Trinity in Unity, of the divine attributes and eternal decrees. It is true, the Bible is not a scientific text book of Cosmic Philosophy, of Natural History or Geology or Astronomy, claiming for itself the authority due to the results of scientific research, of human observation and investigation and speculation. Its claims, also in reference to Cosmology, are infinitely higher. The authority of human scientists is never more than human; the authority of the Scriptures, also where it speaks of mundane things, is simply and unrestrictedly divine. Scientists may err, God can not; scientists have often erred, God never. Where the statements of great scientists and those of the Scriptures are at variance, those of the Scriptures must prevail, not although, but because, the Bible is not a scientific text book, because it is more, it is the word of

God. All due honor to the wisdom of Solomon! but *a greater than Solomon is here.*¹⁾ What we teach in Cosmology is not philosophy, but theology.

Cosmology may be divided into Cosmology in a restricted sense, Pneumatology, or Angelology, and Anthropology.

COSMOLOGY IN THE NARROWER SENSE.

Cosmos, the world, in a restricted sense, the macrocosm, is the aggregate of inanimate and irrational things which God made in the beginning of time to provide for rational beings an abode where, the conditions under, and the means by which they might subsist and fulfill the purposes for which they have their being. In this sense, distinguishing the world, macrocosm, from man, the microcosm, the word, κόσμος, is employed by St. Paul when he describes the gentiles as living ἄθροισι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,²⁾ or by our Savior when he says, 'Ὁ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος,'³⁾ or Ἐγγυῆθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον,⁴⁾ or where he speaks of *gaining the whole world*,⁵⁾ or St. Paul, of *using this world*.⁶⁾ The world is in all these and many other texts viewed as the abode or environments of man, for whose benefit it was made and exists. The world is a sum of a multitude of things, αἰῶνες, *all that exists in time*;⁷⁾ but being κόσμος, an *order* of things, it has its central sphere, and that is the earth, the temporal abode of mankind.⁸⁾ Every cosmology, theological or philosophical, which would make the earth a mere speck in the universe, a diminutive satellite of some other sphere, involves a perversion of biblical cosmology. It is not incumbent upon the theologian to investigate the arguments advanced by astronomers, their

1) Matt. 12, 42. Luke 11, 31.

2) Eph. 2, 12.

3) Matt. 13, 38.

4) John 16, 21.

5) Matt. 16, 26. Mark 8, 36. Luke 9, 25.

6) 1 Cor. 7, 31.

7) Hebr. 1, 2; 13, 3.

8) Acts 17, 26. Rev. 3, 10. Nah. 1, 5. Gen. 1, 28. 29.

hypotheses, observations, computations, speculations, etc., and he is not qualified to sit in judgment upon their scientific results only when he has followed up with scientific equipment and apparatus the various processes by which they have arrived at those results. God made a world of which the earth, the place of man's temporal habitation, is, according to God's own record of creation, the cardinal sphere; and God made no other world but this world, after finishing which, *he rested from all his work which he had made.*¹⁾ This is God's own statement; it is authoritative and conclusive.

Nor is this world of eternal duration. It had a beginning, ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου, *the beginning of the world.*²⁾ This is simply *the beginning*, רֵאשִׁית,³⁾ ἀρχή,⁴⁾ of temporal duration, χρόνος, time, the duration of the world, after which there shall be time no longer,⁵⁾ and before which there was no world and no time. This beginning of time was *the beginning of creation*, ἀρχὴ κτίσεως,⁶⁾ before which there was no creation. This world was the first world that was made, and the Origenistic dream of an eternal series of creations is not only *ultra* but *contra scripturam sapere*. The eternity and immutability of God, which Origen endeavored to uphold with his supposition, is in no wise incompatible with the beginning of creation, which does not constitute or imply a beginning *in* God, but is a beginning *under* God, wrought by an *opus ad extra*, terminating in extra-divine objects.⁷⁾ God was God from everlasting to everlasting before the mountains were brought forth or he had ever formed the earth and the world.⁸⁾ He is the same, and *his* years shall have no end;⁹⁾ neither have they a beginning. But while eternity has not, time had a beginning; and that was when God made the heaven and the earth;¹⁰⁾ and it is in

1) Gen. 2, 2.

2) Matt. 24, 21.

3) Gen. 1, 1.

4) John 1, 1.

5) Rev. 10, 6.

6) Mark 10, 6.

7) THEOL. QUARTERLY, Vol. II, pp. 395 ff.

8) Ps. 90, 2.

9) Ps. 102, 27.

10) Gen. 1, 1.

contrasting God's eternity and immutability with the transient and variable nature of created things that the psalmist says *Of old*, or, as quoted in the New Testament, *In the beginning, thou hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, etc.*¹⁾

To say that God is Creator does not predicate an attribute, but a work of God, by which he did not change, but exert and manifest, his power, wisdom, and goodness. *O Lord God!* says the prophet, *behold, thou hast made the heaven and the earth by thy great POWER;*²⁾ and the psalmist saying, *O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In WISDOM hast thou made them all,*³⁾ sings the praises of him that *by WISDOM made the heavens: for his MERCY endureth forever.*⁴⁾

It should, furthermore, be noted that God is described as *ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ*, *God that made the world and all things therein.*⁵⁾ God did not only make the elements of the world, but the world, *κόσμος*, a well ordered and adorned system, in which the parts are properly related to the whole and among themselves, and proper means are devised and disposed with a view to proper ends. St. Paul speaks of the manifold objects bearing witness to the existence, the power and Godhead, of the Creator as of *τὰ ποιήματα*, *the things that are MADE.*⁶⁾ And *in wisdom he has made ALL his manifold works.*⁷⁾ The earth with its flora and fauna, the heavens with their luminaries, large and small, are not a product or result of millenary evolution from a created chaos of matters and forces, of elementary nebulae drifting and whirling through an ocean of space. The Creator is likened to a builder, who, according to a plan, constructs an edifice, beginning with the foundation,⁸⁾ and the whole work of creation is described in detail, in its be-

1) Ps. 102, 25 ff. Hebr. 1, 10 ff.

2) Jer. 32, 17.

3) Ps. 104, 24.

4) Ps. 136, 5.

5) Acts 17, 24.

6) Rom. 1, 20.

7) Ps. 104, 24.

8) Eph. 1, 4. *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.*

ginning and progress, until, having created the heaven and the earth and made the divisions of land and water, of light and darkness, and caused the earth and the waters to bring forth a multitude of creatures, all of them distinguishable *after their kind*,¹⁾ God saw *every thing that he had made*,²⁾ and *the heavens and the earth were FINISHED, and all the host of them*.³⁾ This is the cosmogony of the first book of the Scriptures; it is also that of the last, which teaches that God *created heaven and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein*.⁴⁾ And this is the uniform teaching of all the Scriptures, which leave no room whatever for any cosmogony based upon or involving a theory of evolution substituted for the doctrine of creation. The world is not God himself made manifest in matter, not an emanation from God, not an eternal principle infinitely co-existing with God, not a product of evolution from eternal or created protoplasms or other primitive forms or elements, but simply and in the true and full sense of the terms a work or aggregate of works of God.

Being an *opus ad extra*, the work of creation was performed with the concurrence of the three Persons of the Godhead.⁵⁾ It was the *Father* who made the world *by the Son*,⁶⁾ *by whom the world was made*,⁷⁾ and *all things were created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible*.⁸⁾ *By the WORD of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by THE BREATH OF HIS MOUTH*,⁹⁾ i. e., by the Spirit of God.¹⁰⁾ But while this work is thus attributed to the three Persons in the Godhead, it is not unscriptural to ascribe it, by appropriation, to the First

1) Gen. 1, 11. 12. 20. 21. 24.

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 2, 1.

4) Rev. 10, 6; cf. 4, 11; 14, 7.

5) THEOL. QUARTERLY, Vol. II, pp. 395 ff.

6) Hebr. 1, 1. 2. *ὃς οὐ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν.*

7) John 1, 10. *ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.*

8) Col. 1, 16.

9) Ps. 33, 6.

10) Gen. 1, 2.

Person, as is done in the Apostles' Creed, since in the texts already quoted the world is said to have been made *by* the Son, *by* the Word of the Lord, and *by* the Breath of his mouth, he who by the Son and the Spirit created the world being the *Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.*¹⁾

Thus, then, the Author of the world is the Triune God, and we now proceed to consider the *mode and manner* in which this work was performed. We read *that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.*²⁾ God did not make one world out of another, or out of the elements or materials of a former world. In the beginning was the Word, and by that word πάντα ἐγένετο, *ALL things were made, or came into being.* The making of heaven and earth, then, was creation ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *ex nihilo*, out of nothing. By his almighty *Fiat* God called into being the things that were not, τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα;³⁾ and that *Fiat* included all the details of the creatures which it called forth. Not germs of creatures, but complete and perfect beings of various forms and kinds and modes of subsistence and propagation appeared at the time and in the manner determined by the creative word of God.⁴⁾ All this is distinctly and plainly stated in the divine record laid down in the book of Genesis. All endeavors to establish a harmony between this record and another record of the genesis of the earth, its flora and its fauna, are to no purpose, however successful the harmonizers may, in the estimation of many, have appeared to be. There can be no such harmony simply because there is no second record of the *hexaemeron*, no book of Genesis written in the stones, the fossiliferous strata of Geology, which might be or not be in harmony with that written in the first book of Moses. If the fossils in the earth

1) See also Acts 17, 24; coll. v. 31.

2) Hebr. 11, 3: μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλέπομένα γεγονέναι.

3) Rom. 4, 17; coll. Gen. 1, 3. 6. 9. 11. 14. 20. 24.

4) Gen. 1, 11. 12. 20. 21. 22. 24. 25.

tell any intelligible tale at all, it is certainly not a story of creation, but of destruction, not a certificate of birth, but of death, death by drowning, probably, in the waters of the Deluge, which carried even to the very mountain tops and buried there, or imbedded in masses of earth and stones partly filling up the lowlands, those remnants of antediluvian organisms out of which later generations of men, wise or otherwise, have endeavored to construct a cosmological alphabet and compose a record of the hexaemeron.

Of course, the hexaemeron thus elaborated is not that of the true and only book of Genesis. That *in six days the Lord made heaven and earth*¹⁾ is as clearly stated in the Scriptures as any thing else is anywhere taught in the Old or the New Testament. These six days are described as natural days, marked by עֶרֶב and בֹּקֶר, *evening and morning*, as our days are, consisting of a period of light and a period of darkness succeeding one another.²⁾ If it is a correct rule of Hermeneutics that the words of a text should be taken in their common signification unless the context or parallelism demand a deviation from such *usus loquendi*, the word, *day*, יוֹם, in Gen. 1, means *day*, and there is no sufficient reason in the world why it should not. But besides and above this, the recorder is very careful to shut out any other signification by describing the days, each of them, saying, *And there was evening, and there was morning, the first day; and there was evening, and there was morning, the second day, and so on to the sixth day.* Again, when God was about to establish the Sabbath as a day of holy rest to Israel, he gave the reason for the choice of the seventh day, saying, *Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work. . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and the sea and all that in them is.*³⁾ Here the *six days* which Israel should labor are certainly natural calendar days; and when in the subsequent context the same words occur without any

1) Exod. 31, 17.

2) Gen. 1, 5. 8. 13. 19. 31.

3) Exod. 20, 9. 11.

indication of a change in the sense, but with every indication of the continuance of the *usus loquendi*, it would be a violation of the laws of interpretation and a manifest perversion of the intended meaning of the words to make it: *Six days shalt thou labor; for in six indefinite periods extending through thousands or millions of years the Lord made heaven and earth.* Of course, if the creation of the world had been the work of naturalists, or the product of a slow process of evolution, six natural days marked by one evening and one morning would have been of insufficient duration. But when God by a *Fiat* of his omnipotence called heaven and earth and all their host into being, there is more reason to wonder why the Creator should, instead of completing his work in one day or hour, have taken six days to perform his work, than to extend the time by assuming creative periods of years and ages, where God himself says DAYS.

The objection that the first three days could not have been *days*, since the sun was not made before the fourth day, cannot preclude the common signification of the word, *day*, in verses 5, 8, and 13, of Gen. 1. The light created on the first day was no less at the Creator's disposal before the creation of the luminaries created on the fourth day than it was on the day when darkness enshrouded Judea while the sun stood high above the cross on Calvary, and when we are told that "there was evening and there was morning" before the sun was made, this statement implies that God had established a provisional order according to which the light created by the *Fiat* of the first day of creation was distributed through space in a manner to produce a decrease and increase of illumination on the face of the earth, and it is vain presumption to speak of impossibilities concerning a stage of creation which no man has seen, when we are so far from knowing all the possibilities of a stage which has been under observation and investigation for thousands of years, and the very nature of light is an unsolved mystery.

But do not the Scriptures say that *One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day?*¹⁾ Certainly, *with the Lord*; but when Moses says, *there was evening, and there was morning, the first day, the second, the third day, etc.*, he does not speak of God's days, eternity, in which there is no succession, no beginning, no end,²⁾ but of days of creation, time, and successive periods of time, each of which had a beginning and an end.

But when God created the world in six days, he did not create the world *for* those days of creation only, but for all time. The earth which God created in the beginning is the earth on which we live to-day; the sun which he made on the fourth day of creation is the sun which shines even now; the vegetable and animal world of our time exists by virtue of the word of its Creator spoken when he said, *Let the earth bring forth grass and herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself;*³⁾ and, *Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.*⁴⁾ These words of the Creator are in force and power to-day. It is God who, as by immediate action, *upholds all things by the word of his power,*⁵⁾ so that *by him all things consist,*⁶⁾ *as in him we live, and move, and have our being;*⁷⁾ and by mediate action, in the established course of nature, *he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;*⁸⁾ *he causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: that he may bring forth food out of the earth;*⁹⁾ *he covereth the heaven with clouds, and prepareth rain for the earth, and maketh grass to grow upon the mountains;*¹⁰⁾ *he maketh darkness, and it is night.*¹¹⁾ The continuous preservation of the inanimate and irrational world no less than of

1) 2 Pet. 3, 8; cf. Ps. 90, 4.

3) Gen. 1, 11, 12.

6) Col. 1, 17.

9) Ps. 104, 14.

4) Gen. 1, 22.

7) Acts 17, 28.

10) Ps. 147, 8.

2) Ps. 102, 27.

5) Hebr. 1, 3.

8) Acts 17, 25.

11) Ps. 104, 20.

the human race is, as its first creation was, a work of the Triune God, who, by immediate and mediate action, preserves and continues what he created in the beginning.

PNEUMATOLOGY, OR ANGELOLOGY.

Within the six days of creation God also made a multitude of angels. These creatures of God, of whose nature and properties we shall speak later on, were not made *before* the world; for the creation of heaven and earth was the *beginning* of creation.¹⁾ Neither were they created *after* the world; for *God rested on the seventh day from ALL his works which he had made.*²⁾ Being creatures of God, *who maketh his angels spirits,*³⁾ they were certainly made within the six days of creation; *for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and ALL that in them is.*⁴⁾ But this is all we know concerning the time when the angels were created. It does not appear whether they were made on the first day or on one of the subsequent days. The Mosaic report makes no special mention of them, since they do not come within its scope, describing, as it does, the genesis of the world as culminating in the creation of man.

Of the nature of angels we learn that they are *spirits*, incorporeal beings. God *maketh his angels SPIRITS;*⁵⁾ they are *all ministering SPIRITS;*⁶⁾ and *a spirit hath not flesh and bones.*⁷⁾ The difference between their nature and ours is not this, that we have a gross, terrestrial, and they a subtle, celestial, material body. For when Jesus said, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have,*⁸⁾ his body was the body of the resurrection, which found no obstacle in closed doors, appeared and disappeared, a *celestial, spiritual body*, *σῶμα ἐπουράνιον, πνευματικόν,*⁹⁾ but not a spirit. Man is

1) Gen. 1, 1. Ps. 102, 25. Mark 10, 6.

2) Gen. 2, 2.

3) Ps. 104, 4.

4) Exod. 20, 11.

5) Ps. 104, 4.

6) Hebr. 1, 14.

7) Luke 24, 39.

8) Ibid.

9) 1 Cor. 15, 40. 44. 46.

made up of a material body and an immaterial soul; angels are complete in their immaterial, spiritual nature. They are *personal* spirits. The *angel of the Lord* who appeared to Zacharias bears a personal name and speaks of himself in the first person, *I am Gabriel*,¹⁾ and the same angel is spoken to and charged with a personal task, when God says, *Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision*.²⁾ Angels have the understanding, emotions and desires of rational beings. *There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth*.³⁾ The mysteries of the salvation of sinners are things *which the angels desire to look into*.⁴⁾ A high order of wisdom is likened to *the wisdom of an angel of God*.⁵⁾ They are also *moral* beings, endowed with a sense of right and wrong, distinguishing what is and what is not in conformity with the holy will of God. They are called *holy angels*,⁶⁾ and the fallen angels are *angels that sinned*.⁷⁾ When St. Paul writes to Timothy, *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things*,⁸⁾ he thereby ascribes to the holy angels the keen moral sense which makes their very presence an awe-inspiring incentive to the conscientious performance of sacred duties on the part of other moral beings. Angels are spirits of great *power*. *The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his MIGHTY angels*,⁹⁾ and the psalmist says, *Bless the Lord, ye his angels that EXCEL IN STRENGTH*.¹⁰⁾ The number of angels is great. *A multitude of the heavenly host*¹¹⁾ sang the *Gloria in Excelsis*. When Daniel saw the *Ancient of days*, thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him.¹²⁾ And St. John *heard the voice of MANY angels*:

1) Luke 1, 11. 19.

2) Dan. 8, 16.

3) Luke 15, 10.

4) 1 Pet. 1, 12.

5) 2 Sam. 14, 20.

6) Matt. 25, 31.

7) 2 Pet. 2, 4. Cf. 1 John 3, 8.

8) 1 Tim. 5, 21.

9) 2 Thess. 1, 7.

10) Ps. 103, 20. See also 2 Kings 19, 35, the smiting of 185,000 Assyrians by the angel of the Lord.

11) Luke 2, 13.

12) Dan. 7, 10.

. . . and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.¹⁾ There are angels and archangels;²⁾ and the thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities and powers in heaven³⁾ appear to indicate ranks and orders among the heavenly host.

While, however, angels are spirits and their power and wisdom is great, they are created and, therefore, finite spirits of limited number and wisdom and power. To God alone divine worship is due, not to angels.⁴⁾ God is the supreme Being; *angels and authorities and powers are subject unto Christ.*⁵⁾ God only is infinite in his essence and attributes. He alone is omniscient; there are things which the angels in heaven do not know. *That day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven,*⁶⁾ and the mysteries of man's salvation are too profound for angels to fathom;⁷⁾ to them, also, God's judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out.⁸⁾

But angels are sexless, and do not propagate their kind. Of the children of the resurrection the Savior says, *In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.*⁹⁾ Hence their number is not increased. Neither is it diminished. Angels are incorruptible and immortal. The children of the resurrection *cannot die any more, for they are equal unto the angels.*¹⁰⁾

All angels were created perfectly good and holy; for at the end of the days of creation *God saw EVERY THING that he had made, and behold, it was VERY GOOD.*¹¹⁾ And while a part of the angels kept not their first estate, another part persevered in their primeval state, and these, *the elect*

1) Rev. 5, 11.

2) 1 Thess. 4, 16.

3) 1 Pet. 3, 22. Col. 1, 16. Eph. 1, 21. Rom. 8, 38.

4) Rev. 19, 10; 22, 8. 9.

5) 1 Pet. 3, 22.

6) Mark 13, 32.

7) 1 Pet. 1, 12.

8) Rom. 11, 33.

9) Matt. 22, 30. Mark 12, 25.

10) Luke 20, 36.

11) Gen. 1, 31.

angels,¹⁾ were confirmed in holiness and in the enjoyment of everlasting bliss and communion with God, in a state of glory. Of these, *the holy angels*²⁾ of God, who are with Christ *in his glory*,³⁾ we read that, like the children of the resurrection, they *cannot die any more*,⁴⁾ and Christ says of them, *they do ALWAYS behold the face of my Father which is in heaven*.⁵⁾ They are, then, in that state of eternal life⁶⁾ with God which awaits us in the world to come, when we, too, shall *ever be with the Lord*⁷⁾ and *see him as he is*.⁸⁾

As to their occupation, the good angels are *ministers* of God, *that do his pleasure*⁹⁾ in various ways. They are *ἄγγελοι*, *messengers*, of the Lord. Angels carried the tidings of the Nativity to the shepherds¹⁰⁾ and heralded the Resurrection to the women of Galilee,¹¹⁾ and to many others the Lord announced his counsels by spirit messengers from about his throne. But angels are *ministering spirits* also in other ways. Angels *came and ministered to Jesus* in the desert,¹²⁾ and *an angel appeared unto him from heaven strengthening him* in Gethsemane.¹³⁾ Nor has the employment of heavenly spirits on earth been discontinued. *They are still ministering spirits, SENT FORTH to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation*.¹⁴⁾ The divine promise to those who *abide under the shadow of the Almighty*¹⁵⁾ is still good which says, *He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands lest thou dash thy foot against a stone*.¹⁶⁾ From the cradle to the grave and beyond the grave God's elect are under the guidance and protection of the angels of God.

1) 1 Tim. 5, 21.

2) Matt. 25, 31.

3) Ibid. Cf. Luke 2, 9. Matt. 28, 2. 3.

4) Luke 20, 36.

5) Matt. 18, 10.

6) Matt. 25, 46. Tit. 3, 7. 1 John 2, 25.

7) 1 Thess. 4, 17. John 17, 24. Rev. 21, 3.

8) 1 John 3, 2. Matt. 5, 8. Job 19, 26.

9) Ps. 103, 21.

10) Luke 2, 9—14.

11) Mark 16, 6. 7.

12) Matt. 4, 11.

13) Luke 22, 43.

14) Hebr. 1, 14.

15) Ps. 91, 1.

16) Ps. 91, 11. 12.

*Take heed, says the Savior, that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven THEIR angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven,*¹⁾ thus indicating that special angels are entrusted with the guardian care of individual children given in their charge. Amid the dangers of our riper years we may take comfort in the assurance that *the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him and delivereth them.*²⁾ Even in the hour of death, angels hover by our bedside and bear our departing souls to Paradise on high, even as *Lazarus was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.*³⁾ And at the end of time, when the Son of Man shall come again in his glory, the heavenly host shall be his retinue,⁴⁾ and *he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.*⁵⁾ Then they who are even now *come to an innumerable company of angels*⁶⁾ shall by their companions of divine appointment be escorted to their eternal rest, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels.⁷⁾

On that same day, however, mention will be made of another class of angels. To the great assembly of men on his left hand, the Son of Man shall say, *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his ANGELS.*⁸⁾ These are the *angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation,*⁹⁾ the *angels that sinned.*¹⁰⁾ They are called *demons*, δαίμονες, or δαιμόνια,¹¹⁾ and their number, too, is great.¹²⁾ They are *spirits*, πνεύματα.¹³⁾ They are personal spirits. The devil who tempted Christ

1) Matt. 18, 10.

2) Ps. 34, 7.

3) Luke 16, 22.

4) Matt. 25, 31. 1 Thess. 4, 16.

5) Matt. 24, 31. Cf. Matt. 13, 30; coll. 39—42.

6) Hebr. 12, 22.

7) 2 Thess. 1, 7.

8) Matt. 25, 41.

9) Jude 6.

10) 2 Pet. 2, 4.

11) Matt. 8, 31; 12, 27. Mark 1, 34; 16, 9. Luke 8, 30. 1 Cor. 10, 20.

12) Mark 5, 9; 1, 34. Luke 8, 30.

13) Mark 1, 23. Matt. 10, 1.

in the desert speaks of himself in the first person,¹⁾ and is spoken to by Christ in the second person,²⁾ and St. Paul speaks of *the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience* τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργούντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας,³⁾ as of a personal spirit; for ἐνεργεῖν, the active form of the verb, is invariably used of personal agents,⁴⁾ while of impersonal agency the medial form, ἐνεργεῖται, is used.⁵⁾ They are described as the *angels that sinned*.⁶⁾ But to sin can only be ascribed to intelligent, personal beings with a moral sense of right and wrong, and such only can be *reserved unto judgment*.⁷⁾

What the precise nature of the sin was by which the evil angels fell from their first estate, we do not know; neither are we informed as to the exact time at which their fall took place. But when we are told that on the sixth day of creation *God saw every thing that he made, and behold, it was very good*,⁸⁾ we learn that these angels, too, were not created evil, but very good, and that their fall took place after the entire work of creation was finished. We furthermore know that the fall of the evil angels came about before the fall of man; for it was Satan who deceived our first mother, Eve,⁹⁾ and the devil is said to *sin from the beginning*,¹⁰⁾ and to be *a liar and the FATHER of it*.¹¹⁾ The devil, then, is the originator of sin and all evil in the world. This is the scriptural answer to one of the great questions of the Gnostics, ποθεν τὸ κακόν; though it is by no means a solution of the problem philosophically considered. How it was possible that in a creation which was good, and a creature which was holy, evil should originate, we cannot comprehend. When man sinned, it was under prompting influence

1) Matt. 4, 9.

2) Matt. 4, 10. Cf. Matt. 8, 29. 31. 32.

3) Eph. 2, 2.

4) 1 Cor. 12, 6. Gal. 2, 8. Eph. 1, 11.

5) 1 Thess. 2, 13. Rom. 7, 5. Col. 1, 29. 2 Thess. 2, 7.

6) 2 Pet. 2, 4. Cf. 1 John 3, 8.

7) 2 Pet. 2, 4.

8) Gen. 1, 31.

9) Gen. 3, 1—5. Coll. Rev. 12, 9; 20, 2. 2 Cor. 11, 3.

10) 1 John 3, 8.

11) John 8, 44. Coll. Gen. 3, 4. 5.

from without, and even man's fall is a metaphysical mystery. But Satan fell untempted, not yielding to evil from without, but engendering evil within himself. Evil, then, is not a substance; God only can create substance. Least of all is matter the evil principle; for God created matter, and it was good; and Satan, in whom evil originated, is a spirit and remained a spirit in and after his fall.¹⁾ But from good, holy spirits he and his angels changed themselves into evil, wicked, unclean spirits.²⁾ Their intellectual and moral faculties were perverted and depraved. The devils still know and believe that there is one God, and tremble;³⁾ they know that Jesus is the Son of God,⁴⁾ the Holy One of God.⁵⁾ And yet the devil who tempted the Son of God entertained the thought that he might succeed in seducing the Holy One to sin,⁶⁾ which implied a denial of his divinity. This perverted understanding is bound up with depraved, unclean affections and desires,⁷⁾ evil lusts,⁸⁾ a proneness to murder and lying which marks his character as that of a *murderer* and a *liar*, who *when he speaketh a lie, speaketh of his own*.⁹⁾ The will of these fallen angels is set against the will of God and against everything that is good. The devil is ὁ διάβολος, *the adversary, the enemy*, κατ' ἐξοχήν,¹⁰⁾ *the wicked one*.¹¹⁾ This *spiritual wickedness in high places* fights against God and *wrestles* with the servants of God, making war, or "contention by way of force or deceit,"¹²⁾ as St. Paul writes, *Put on the WHOLE ARMOR of God, that ye may be able to STAND against the WILES of the devil. For we WRESTLE not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of*

1) Eph. 6, 12.

2) Mark 1, 23. Eph. 6, 12.

3) James 2, 19.

4) Matt. 8, 29. Mark 5, 7.

5) Mark 1, 24. Luke 4, 34.

6) Matt. 4, 1 ff. Luke 4, 3 ff.

7) Mark 1, 23. Matt. 10, 1.

8) John 8, 44.

9) Ibid.

10) Matt. 13, 25. 39.

11) Matt. 13, 19. 38.

12) Bynkershock, Obs. jur. publ. L. 1, c. 1, defines *war* as *contentio per vim et dolum*. and Twiss, Law of Nations, p. 44, as a *contention*, by *way of force or deceit*.

*this world, against SPIRITUAL WICKEDNESS in high places.*¹⁾ Thus the infernal host is engaged in organized and systematic enmity against God and his kingdom. Satan, the devil, the chief of his angels,²⁾ marshals his forces, arrayed under their officers, the *rulers of darkness*,³⁾ *principalities and powers*,⁴⁾ and leads them in offensive and defensive strategy. His allies are the *children of disobedience*, in whom he *works*,⁵⁾ for he is also *the prince*⁶⁾ and *the god of this world*.⁷⁾ Satan carries his warfare into the very heart of God's kingdom, the church; false doctrines, *the doctrines of devils*,⁸⁾ are among his most efficient weapons, and one of his first lieutenants, *whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish*,⁹⁾ Antichrist, that man of sin, the son of perdition, *sitteth in the temple of God*,¹⁰⁾ the church of Christ. Or his attacks are directed against the church and its members from without. Fierce persecutions and afflictions visited on the Christians in the world are instigated by the devil. This is what the Apostle indicated, saying, *Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour. Whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world*.¹¹⁾ Thus the lion roared in the days of Nero and Marcus Aurelius, and we read of those who resisted steadfast in the faith, Peter and Paul, Maturus, Sanctus, Attalus, Blandina; and the lion roared in the days of Decius and devoured many who denied and apostatized. At the same time, Satan is occupied in strengthening *his kingdom*¹²⁾ and holding his own, or recovering what for a

1) Eph. 6, 11. 12.

2) Matt. 5, 21.

3) Eph. 6, 12.

4) Ibid.

5) Eph. 2, 2.

6) John 14, 30; 16, 11. ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.

7) 2 Cor. 4, 4. ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.

8) 1 Tim. 4, 1. διδασκαλῖαι δαιμονίων.

9) 2 Thess. 2, 9. 10.

10) 2 Thess. 2, 3. 4.

11) 1 Pet. 5, 8. 9.

12) Luke 11, 18.

time had been wrenched from his power. He *worketh in the children of disobedience*;¹⁾ he *blinds the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine into them*;²⁾ and when the gospel has been preached to them, *then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved*.³⁾ There are those who, for a time, have been liberated from his power; but *when the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished, not in a state of watchful defence, but prepared for feasting and merriment, as in times of peace and security; and of this he takes advantage; he taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first*.⁴⁾ Judas Iscariot had become a disciple of Christ; but the day came when *the devil had now put into his heart to betray Jesus*.⁵⁾ Ananias had become a member of the church at Jerusalem; but *Satan filled his heart to lie to the Holy Ghost*.⁶⁾ We know to what end both Judas and Ananias came.

Yet, while Satan is like a *strong man armed*,⁷⁾ and while we have every reason to *be sober and vigilant*,⁸⁾ in view of the wiles of *our adversary the devil*, Satan and his infernal host are not omnipotent; if we resist him steadfast in the faith,⁹⁾ *he will flee from us*;¹⁰⁾ in the whole armor of God we are able to withstand him, and with the shield of faith we may quench his fiery darts.¹¹⁾

Under the permissive providence of God, the devil may take possession of men's bodies, tie their senses or move

1) Eph. 2, 2.

2) 2 Cor. 4, 4.

3) Luke 8, 12.

4) Luke 11, 24—26.

5) John 13, 2.

6) Acts 5, 3.

7) Luke 11, 21.

8) 1 Pet. 5, 8.

9) 1 Pet. 5, 9.

10) James 4, 7.

11) Eph. 6, 13. 16.

their members. The use of a person's organs of speech by two intellects or conflicting wills, as when the subject speaks languages naturally unknown to him or her, or obscene or blasphemous words in spite of manifest efforts to suppress them, or true statements concerning persons or things or events he or she cannot naturally know, as well as superhuman exertions of strength and monstrous ravings, are among the symptoms of bodily possession.¹⁾ Even God's children may be afflicted with physical ailment through satanic influence. To Paul *there was given a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him,*²⁾ and Jesus healed *a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years,*³⁾ whom *Satan had bound,*⁴⁾ being *a daughter of Abraham.*⁵⁾ But in these and similar exertions of their power, the evil spirits are subject to God's supreme dominion and control and confined within the bounds of his permission. Before the first trial of Job, *the Lord said unto Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand;*⁶⁾ and, once more, *the Lord said unto Satan, Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life;*⁷⁾ and Jesus loosed the woman whom Satan had bound for eighteen years.⁸⁾

On the other hand, the evil spirits themselves are bound for ever, never to be loosed. By the just judgment of God they were condemned to everlasting punishment in a confirmed state of wrath. For them there is no redemption, no salvation. Christ the Redeemer *took not on him the nature of angels,*⁹⁾ to become the substitute of fallen spirits and work their redemption. *God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judg-*

1) Acts 16, 16—18. Matt. 8, 28. 29; 17, 25. Mark 9, 17. 18. 20; 5, 5. Acts 19, 15. 16.

2) 2 Cor. 12, 7.

3) Luke 13, 11.

4) Luke 13, 16.

5) Ibid.

6) Job 1, 12.

7) Job 2, 6.

8) Luke 13, 16.

9) Hebr. 2, 16.

*ment;*¹⁾ *and the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in EVERLASTING CHAINS under darkness unto the judgment of the great day;*²⁾ *and everlasting fire was prepared for the devil and his angels,*³⁾ *all of them without exception. The day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God*⁴⁾ *will also be the day of their public judgment, the public condemnation of the angels that sinned.*⁵⁾ A. G.

1) 2 Pet. 2, 4.

2) Jude 6.

3) Matt. 25, 41.

4) Rom. 2, 5.

5) 2 Pet. 2, 4. Jude 6.

(To be continued.)

Exegetical Theology.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM

WITH A

PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

(Continued.)

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Matt. 12, 8: *The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day.*

The disciples of Christ, while passing through a corn-field with their Master on a sabbath day, and being hungry, had plucked ears of corn and eaten. For this the Pharisees had upbraided Jesus and accused the disciples of an unlawful act. But Jesus justified his disciples and himself and reproved the Pharisees for not knowing the letter or understanding the spirit of the law even as it was binding upon the Jews. Thus, the Mosaic laws prohibited all men but the priests to eat of the show bread in the temple; and yet King David and they who were with him had eaten of the show bread when they were hungry, and they committed no wrong. And, furthermore, he continues, does not the law itself, Lev. 24, 8. Num. 28, 9. 10, permit to or even enjoin upon the priests the performance of certain duties in the temple on the sabbath day? Now, then, if the holiness of the temple permitted or even required such services in the face of the law, how can you reprimand my disciples for doing what they have done in my presence? "I say unto you that one greater than the temple is here." He in whom dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily, Col. 2, 9.

Having thus shown them that they did not even properly know the letter of the law, he proceeds to show them

that they have even less knowledge of the spirit of the law, according to which love, compassionate love, is the fulfillment of the law. "For had ye known," says he, "what it means, I desire mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." And guiltless they certainly were; "for the Son of Man is Lord even of the sabbath day." This settles the whole question. He who understands the law of the sabbath as Christ understands it, and who observes it as Christ would have it observed, truly understands and observes it, no matter what the blind Pharisees and the like of them may say to the contrary. And when, finally, Christ sets aside or entirely abrogates the sabbath, it is set aside or abrogated by the Lord of the sabbath, and no authority in heaven or earth shall any longer make it binding on any man's conscience.

Col. 2, 16. 17: *Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are the shadow of things to come; but the body is in Christ.*

The admonition of which this text is a part begins in v. 8 of the chapter, where the apostle says: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men," etc. He then proceeds to show how Christ had done away with the rite of circumcision by substituting the spiritual "circumcision made without hands," especially in the sacrament of Baptism, vv. 11—13, how he abrogated the whole handwriting of ordinances, the Mosaic law, v. 14, and made us free from all manner of spiritual thralldom, v. 15. "Therefore," *ὁὖν*, he continues, "since the law is taken from your necks and you are free children of God in and through Christ crucified, and complete in him who is the head of all principality and power, v. 10, let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are the shadow of things to come; but the

body is in Christ." Judgment, he would say, is according to the law; where there is no law, there can be no judgment. Now the law of circumcision, of meat and drink, of holydays, new moons and the sabbath days, is cancelled and abrogated since Christ is come and the new dispensation, which was foreshadowed by the rites and sacraments of the old; and, therefore, the judaizing teachers, with their philosophy, v. 8, are entirely out of date and only endeavor to place a yoke on your necks which Christ would not have you bear, Acts 15, 10. Thus, then, the Augsburg Confession is in full accord with St. Paul when, having made reference to our text, it says in the 28th article: "Such is the observation of the Lord's day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and like holydays and rites. For they that think that the observation of the Lord's day was appointed by the authority of the church, instead of the sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived. The Scripture, which teaches that all the Mosaic ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the sabbath."

Hebr. 10, 25: *Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is.*

In the preceding verses the Christians are exhorted to draw near to God, or to offer divine worship, Hebr. 7, 25; 11, 6; 4, 16, in the house of God, the church of Christ, in which Christ is the great high priest, vv. 21 and 22. All the elements of Christian worship are implicitly or explicitly indicated in the words following. The full assurance of faith, the sanctifying of our bodies and souls, v. 22, must be wrought by the means of grace, the word and sacraments of the new covenant, prefigured by the ritual sprinkling and washing of the former dispensation. The profession of faith, the praise of God for all his bountiful goodness according to his promises, and works of brotherly love to which Christians provoke one another, are the acceptable sacrifices of the children of God. And all this intercourse with God

and with one another we should exercise not only privately and individually, but *not forsaking*, by non-attendance, *the assembling of ourselves together*. Ἐπισυναγωγή can not stand here for congregation, the local body of Christian people, and ἐγκαταλείπειν can not mean the separation from such body by dissolution of church membership, since that could not be described as ἔθος, a custom; but ἐπισυναγωγή is the assembling together in religious meetings for Christian worship, for common and mutual edification and communication, from which even in those early days some members of Christian congregations stood aloof. But it is the will of God that Christians should thus assemble, though he has not prescribed times and places when and where such meetings must be held; and he who refuses to attend public worship when his brethren the world over have appointed Sunday as the day of common edification should know that he sins against the will of God, not because it is Sunday, but because it is public worship, which he sets aside.

Acts 2, 42: *And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.*

The second chapter of the Acts is a narrative of the origin of the first Christian congregation at Jerusalem. To this whole congregation the pronoun *they* in our text refers. In four things the members of this church are said to have continued steadfastly. The first was the *apostles' doctrine*, ἡ διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων. The apostles were the teachers of the church, and all the members of the congregation came to hear them, and not only occasionally, but regularly and assiduously, paying close attention to what they were permitted to hear: ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες. To hear the doctrine of the apostles was from the beginning of the church the chief element of public worship. The *communion*, κοινωνία, mentioned next, is not the internal communion of Christians inasmuch as they are united in Christ as members of

his body by the unity of faith, but, as the hearing of the word, the breaking of the bread, and prayer, with which it is placed in line, a common occupation of the members of the church, an outward manifestation of the internal union and communion, existing also in the exercise of fraternal benevolence, which was from the beginning so prominent a feature in the religious life of the early church. Thus Rom. 15, 26. 2 Cor. 9, 13. Hebr. 13, 16, the contributions for the support of indigent brethren, as also of the ministry, are especially called *κοινωνία*, in which sense also the verb *κοινωνεῖν* is used Rom. 12, 13. Gal. 6, 6; and 1 Cor. 16, 1. 2 we learn that these contributions were made on the common meeting day of the Christians in apostolic times. Cf. Acts 4, 35. 37; 5, 2. The *breaking of the bread*, *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, signifies the common meals and, in connection therewith, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which constituted a part of the regular public services in the early church; cf. verse 46. Acts 20, 7. 1 Cor. 10, 16; 11, 20—34. Of common *prayer* as an act of common worship we read Acts 4, 23. 31; 6, 6; 13, 3. 1 Cor. 11, 4. 5; 14, 14 ff. It is of the meetings in which Christian congregations were occupied with these various religious exercises that the preceding text speaks, warning all Christians not to forsake the assembling of themselves together.

John 8, 47: *He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.*

In the preceding verse Jesus had asked his enemies the question, "If I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" This was a question the Jews preferred not to answer, and Jesus answers it for them in our text. He had already told them that they are not of God, but of their father the devil, vv. 42 and 44, and now he argues along the same line. His first proposition is: *He that is of God heareth God's words*. Compared with verse 44, to be of God, *εἶναι ἐκ θεοῦ*, here means to be a child of God. To

hear God's words does not mean merely to hear with the ears, but to hear and accept what God says; for the Jews were even then hearing Jesus, but not as God's word should be heard, since, when Jesus told them the truth, they did not believe him, vv. 45 and 46. In a similar sense *to hear* is used Matt. 18, 15. 17 and Luke 10, 16. What Jesus would say is, He that is a child of God hears, accepts, and believes the word of God. And now the question of verse 46 was easily answered. That the obstinate Jews were not of God had already been said and proven, vv. 42 and 44, and hence they were not the kind of men that hear the word of God as it should be heard. This is Christ's argument to the Jews. But Christ still speaks in his word, and his argument also applies to those who would be Christians, but do not hear and accept what God says in his word. They do not hear, because they are not of God. And, again, God speaks wherever his messengers and ministers preach his truth, and he who refuses to hear such preaching and yet considers himself a child of God, deceives himself.

Luke 10, 16: *He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.*

These words were spoken to the seventy disciples whom Christ had chosen to be preachers of the Gospel, and they are the closing words of his charge to them as his messengers. Thus also when he had commissioned his "twelve disciples" and was about to close his charge to them, Matt. 10, 5—42, he said, "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me," v. 40. God deals with man through human ministers, men with human frailties and shortcomings, when his word is preached. And knowing this we should not refuse but be ready and willing to hear them as we should gladly hear Christ in person and God himself, and confidently trust in

his word and willingly obey his commandments. For to despise the messengers of God is to despise God himself whose message they carry. And especially when God has ordained that the Gospel should be preached by men who are called to the ministerial office, it is his holy will that men should not deem it sufficient to use the written word of God, but also hear the preaching of the word according to Christ's ordinance, knowing that a refusal to hear such preaching, however humble the messenger may be, is a disregard of Christ himself.

Hos. 4, 6: *Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee.*

The entire verse of which this text is a part reads thus: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children." From the opening words of the verse it appears that the censure here pronounced is not aimed at the ungodly world, but at the people of God, those among whom the Lord has established his worship and the preaching of his word, the people of whom St. Paul says Rom. 3, 2 that unto them were committed the oracles of God. But God has given his word that it should be known, and the knowledge here spoken of is not secular knowledge, but, as the parallelism of the verse shows, the knowledge of the revealed will of God, and God demands that those who would worship him as his priestly people should know his will and keep it in remembrance. To hear and learn the word of God and to grow in spiritual wisdom and knowledge is the chief part of all true worship, and he who refuses to learn what God would teach him should know that his worship is an abomination in the sight of God, and that God will punish the contempt of his word by temporal and eternal penalties.

Is. 66, 2: *To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.*

In the preceding context God has spoken by the prophet of his supreme majesty, saying, "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye built unto me? and where is the place of my rest? For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the Lord." In the subsequent context he speaks of those who bring sacrifices which are an abomination in the sight of God, but who, when God called, did not answer, and when he spoke, did not hear, vv. 1, 3 and 4. But the true worshiper, upon whom God would look with divine pleasure, is described in our text as being poor or bowed down and of a contrite spirit and trembling at the word of God, the word of him, whose throne is the heaven and whose footstool is the earth, the maker and preserver of all things, who would deal with us by his word, the word of the law, whereby he humbles the sinful heart, and of the Gospel, whereby he lifts with an everlasting grace those who have humbled themselves before him. Blessed is he, who thus in the day of grace trembleth before the word of God; for he shall stand among the blessed of the father rejoicing when others shall tremble at the word of the Lord when he shall fix his judgment throne in midheaven.

Eccl. 5, 1: *Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools: for they consider not that they do evil.*

This text also is a warning against the mere outward worship of those who go to the house of God, unmindful of the true purpose of public worship. Hence this admonition is also directed to the members of the visible church lest they deceive themselves. Not every outward worship is true worship. It may be the sacrifice of fools, who in their ignorance do evil where they and others imagine that they

are doing what is good and acceptable before God. *Keep thy foot*, says the Lord, that is, be not unmindful where thou goest when on the way to the house of God, knowing that it is the place where God would speak to thee to make thee wise unto salvation and thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and hence thy chief purpose in coming to the house of God should be to hear and to receive in a willing heart the word of thy God. To heed this admonition is the proper preparation for divine worship, and the neglect of such preparation is apt to deprive the worshiper of much or all of the blessing which God has intended for him in the public administration of the means of grace.

Ps. 26, 6—8: *So will I compass thine altar, O Lord: that I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wondrous works. Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house, and the place where thine honor dwelleth.*

Here the psalmist utters his delight in public worship as an occupation of those who are priests of the Most High. It was the altar of the Lord about which the priests in the temple of Jehovah were occupied bringing sacrifice to the Lord and intoning the songs of praise and thanksgiving in which the congregation was to join, giving thanks and telling of the wondrous works of God. Thus in the worship of Israel God visited his people and graciously accepted the sacrifices of their hearts and lips and hands. And this was the beauty of the temple of the Lord, the habitation of his grace and the place where his honor dwelled. Such also is the public worship of Christian congregations to-day. There the peculiar people of God appear as a royal priesthood in the habitation of God's house, where he comes to them and dwells among them with his holy word, where those who speak tell of all his wondrous works and intone the songs of praise and thanksgiving, spiritual sacrifices on the altar of the Lord. And hence we should also love this spiritual sanctuary of God and rejoice in the exercises for which Christians unite and hold joint communion with their God.

1 Thess. 2, 13: *When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God.*

Where this text in the English Bible has the word *received*, the original Greek has two different words, *παράλαμβάνειν* and *δέχεσθαι*, and a more literal translation would be: "Receiving the word of preaching by us of God," or: "the word of God as it is preached by us, ye accepted it not as the word of men," etc. There are men who receive the word of God when and where it is preached, and this outward hearing, of which even natural man is in a measure capable, is not superfluous; he who would not even outwardly hear the word, refuses to permit the blessings of divine grace to be brought even near his heart. And again, that which is outwardly received or heard, should be "the word of God" preached by the apostles or those who bring the doctrine of the apostles. False doctrine should not even be outwardly received, but avoided as endangering our salvation. But merely to hear the word is not sufficient, but hearing the word of God, *παραλαμβάνοντες*, we should also *δέχεσθαι*, inwardly receive or accept it as the word of God, with due veneration, believing all its statements, relying on all its promises, and willingly obeying its demands. This, however, is not within the power of natural man, but a gift of God. This is indicated by the context, when the Apostle says: "*For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God,*" etc. And thus we also should thank God, when by his grace we have been led properly to receive and accept the word of God, which is able to save our souls, James 1, 21.

Col. 3, 16: *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.*

A Christian congregation is in this text likened to a house in which the word of Christ should find a habitation.

The word of God should not only be an occasional guest, but should dwell continually, ἐνοικεῖτω, in the church, and not sparingly, but richly, πλουσίως, abundantly, in excess of what is needful for the immediate wants of the children of the household for the mere sustenance of spiritual life. Christians should also grow according to the spirit, and should also yield forth to others what may quicken and nourish them unto salvation. In their endeavors to have the word of Christ richly among them, the Christians should seek various ways of voicing forth such word of God, and the Apostle comes to their aid by adding to his general admonition special advice. Not only by preaching the word, but by teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs the members of the church may yield forth spiritual blessing to each other. *Ψάλλμοι* are religious songs in general, *ᾠμοι*, songs of praise, *ὠδαὶ πνευματικαί*, spiritual songs. Thus when, in our church, songs treating of the doctrines of the Christian religion, of God and his will and counsel, of Christ and his redemption, of the church and the means of grace, of faith and justification, of Christian life and hope, are sung by or to the congregation, such singing constitutes a most impressive form of mutual instruction, admonition and edification, and when and where the voice of spiritual song is lifted up it should find its response within the hearts of those who sing and hear, and they should "sing with their hearts to the Lord," as the Apostle here says. But this again we cannot do of ourselves, but it must be done "with grace" or "in the grace of God." *Ἐν τῇ χάριτι* is in the English Bible correctly construed with the following word *ᾄδοντες*. They only who are compassed about by the grace of God will sound the praises of that grace within their hearts, being truly edified by the songs they hear with their ears.

Luke 11, 28: *Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.*

This text has already been considered in a different connection. See Vol. II, pp. 288 f. The words which should be particularly noted here are *hear* and *accept*, ἀκούοντες καὶ φυλάσσοντες. We cannot keep the word of God without hearing it, and hearing it ever anew. It is not sufficient to have heard it in early youth, but it must be heard throughout our lives, and that not only as a matter of form, but as a matter of necessity, without which we cannot spiritually prosper. Even Mary, the mother of Christ, was no exception. But hearing alone will not suffice, the word should also be kept or guarded. To guard a word is to pay attention to what it means, demands, promises, gives, confers, and secures, and to lose no opportunity of gaining the full benefit which may be derived therefrom. And only they who both hear and keep the word of God are blessed here and hereafter.

Gal. 6, 6: *Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.*

This is one of a series of admonitions directed to a Christian congregation. The Apostle supposes that Christians are being instructed in the word of God, not only by way of preparation, as of candidates for Baptism or Confirmation, but also after they have become acknowledged members of the church, growing in grace by acquiring a more extensive and intensive knowledge of divine truth as it is revealed in Christ and his word. The utterance of this supposition is itself a word of approval to those who are, and of reproof to those who are not, willing learners of the word. This is the first admonition embodied in the text. The second is, that those who are being instructed and thereby receive spiritual blessings through the faithful labors of their teachers should contribute of their temporal possessions to the support of those who teach them and who, according to 1 Cor. 9, 14, should live of the Gospel while they preach the Gospel. The words κοινωνεῖτω ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς enjoin upon each member of the congregation the

duty of contributing according to his means toward the support of the ministry, and the subsequent context shows that the Apostle is very earnest in his admonition, adding a threat to those who will not, and a promise to those who will, heed his words.

THE SECOND TABLE.

Matt. 7, 12: *All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.*

The sermon on the mount, from which this text is taken, is an exposition of the law, not the exhibition or promulgation of a new law which should take the place of the law as it had been in force before the days of Christ, but the moral law of God, the manifestation of God's holy will to men. And of the law as far as it regulates our conduct toward our fellow-men Christ gives the sum and substance in this text. That the following words are a summary of the preceding discourse is indicated by οὕτως. That he would not here summarize a new law, but all the moral precepts for our conduct toward our neighbor laid down in the word of God, is expressly said in the words: *for this is the law and the prophets*, i. e., all the Scriptures inasmuch as they are law. The same summary had already been recorded Lev. 19, 18: *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*; cf. Matt. 22, 39. But the form here given by Christ is more explicit and practical, showing how we may apply the rule. The simple way of learning what in any given case we should do to our neighbor is, to enquire what we would that he or others should do to us if we were in his place. This is indeed a golden rule, easy of application, and unfailing if properly applied. But it is a gross abuse of this rule, to pervert this summary of the law into a summary of the Gospel by teaching that to "live up to the golden rule" is Christianity, the true religion. He who would be saved by living according to this rule will as surely be damned as

a thief or murderer who refuses to believe in Christ Jesus. For if the law condemns all men, the summary of the law cannot save, but must certainly and summarily condemn.

Gal. 6, 10: *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.*

The word correctly rendered *opportunity*, *καιρός*, is the present period of time with its peculiar circumstances, while *χρόνος* is time conceived as a line extending through a series of periods. The question, who is my neighbor? must be answered in consideration of times and circumstances, all men being our neighbors as we have opportunity to do them good. At the same time, however, the apostle points out a category of fellow-men in whose favor we should discriminate, when he says: *Especially unto them who are of the household of faith*, our brethren in Christ, the members of Christian congregations. In a similar way St. Paul points out such as should be provided for before others, when he says, 1 Tim. 5, 8: *But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith.* But while it is proper that we should exercise due discrimination in doing good, the text before us at the same time teaches that we should not restrict our benevolence to the members of our natural and spiritual household when we find opportunity to do good to others besides and beyond them.

Matt. 5, 44. 45: *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust.*

The Jewish teachers had perverted the divine commandment, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*, by

drawing the false conclusion: If it is our neighbor we should love, we may, and even should, hate our enemy. This is what Christ has pointed out in the preceding context, v. 43, saying, *Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy;* and to refute this perversion of the law he continues, *But I say unto you, love your enemies,* etc. There is, however, need of inculcating this precept at all times, since the perverted nature not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles, prompted and prompts them to repay enmity with enmity. To love an enemy instead of hating him and being revenged or seeking revenge for injuries received was looked upon as a weakness unworthy of a man by the ancient Greeks and Romans, and is largely looked upon as cowardice and a lack of selfrespect to-day. And thus to-day, to love our enemies and to bless those who curse us, to do good to them that hate us, and to pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us, is not the conduct of natural man but of the children of God, who have from their Father in heaven received a mind which makes them akin to their Father, who also makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. Yet even this is not a new law, but a restatement of and in full keeping with the spirit of the law which the Jews have perverted, and a summary of which we have seen in Matt. 7, 12; for no man desires that his enemy should retaliate evil for evil and inflict vengeance for every offense.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Prov. 30, 17: *The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it.*

To mock a father and to refuse obedience to a mother is in this text forcibly pictured as a heinous sin, worthy not only of death, but of an ignominious death and the denial

of decent burial. For to lie unburied, a prey to dogs and the fowl of the air, was, in Israel, and even among the Gentiles, looked upon as being under a curse, an object of divine wrath; 1 Kings 13, 22; 14, 11; 16, 4; 21, 24. Jer. 7, 33; 8, 2; 9, 22; 14, 16; 16, 4; 25, 33. Heseek. 29, 5. Ps. 79, 3 ff. Even the dead bodies of executed criminals were to be taken down and buried before the night was over, Deut. 21, 22. 23; and of the "cursed woman," Jezebel, it was recorded that nothing was left of her but a few bones when she was to be buried, 2 Kings 9, 35.

Rom. 13, 2: *Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.*

In the previous context the apostle has inculcated obedience to the higher powers, especially to civil governments, for the reason that there is no power but of God and by divine ordinance. Hence, ὥστε, the apostle continues by way of argument, ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, who, instead of ὑποτάσσασθαι, of submitting himself or being subject to the powers, v. 1, sets himself against the government, resists not only the ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, 1 Pet. 2, 13, but τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ, the divine ordinance, τοῦ θεοῦ being emphasized by its position before διαταγῇ. And the *damnation*, κρίσις, *judgment*, which they shall receive, is not only the human penalty of rebellion or willful violation of the law, but divine judgment, imposed upon him who has rebelled against God by resisting those whom God has clothed with his own majesty. For this reason the apostle says, v. 5: "Ye must needs be subject also for conscience sake," that is, as those who deal with God in their conduct toward their civil superiors.

1 Pet. 2, 18: *Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.*

Servants, οἰκέται, is the milder term for δοῦλοι, *slaves*. They are here described as ὑποτασσόμενοι, *subordinate*. To supply ἦτε, the imperative, *be*, of the English Bible, is an unnecessary and, therefore, undue liberty. The verb to which the participle is to be referred is either τιμῆσατε or τιμᾶτε, v. 17, or ὑποτάγητε, v. 13, which opens this series of admonitions with a general injunction of submission to every ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει. Servants should be subject to their masters ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ, *in all fear*. Φόβος, *fear*, is the consciousness of inferiority under a superior power or authority which it is dangerous to disregard. The reason why servants should submit themselves to their masters, not only to the good but also to the froward, σκολιοί, the *unfair* or *unjust*, the reverse of δίκαιοι, Prov. 28, 11, coll. Luke 3, 5, is stated in the subsequent context which says: "For this is *thankworthy*, if a man *for conscience toward God* endure grief." Servants should remember that by divine ordinance they are subject to their masters and should therefore submit themselves for conscience's sake, in the fear of God, who, no matter how their masters may be disposed toward them, has placed the superiors in authority.

Eph. 6, 2. 3: *Honor thy father and thy mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.*

In the previous context, v. 1, the apostle enjoins upon all children obedience to their parents, because this is δίκαιον, *right*, according to the law of God, and, quoting this law of God in our text, he proceeds to describe the frame of mind whence such obedience should spring. Filial obedience should proceed from a heart which *honors* father and mother, holds them in high esteem. And that such esteem is well founded, appears from the fact that God himself has distinguished this commandment by making it ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, *the first commandment in point of promise*, though not the first ἐν τῇ τάξει, in order of arrange-

ment, in which it is the fourth. The promise in Exod. 26, 6. Deut. 5, 10, is not a promise attached to one special commandment, but pertains to the decalogue as a whole, wherefore Luther has correctly placed it at the end of the ten commandments. The promise itself is given in verse 3, not in the Jewish form, Exod. 20, 12. Deut. 5, 16, where it is restricted to the land of Canaan for the children of Israel, but simply ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, on the earth, in this temporal life. The promise here given has this in common with all temporal blessings, that it is under the wise providence of God, who adjusts the fulfillment of his promise to the higher interests of his children, and, being a temporal blessing, God often fulfills this promise also to such children as by unbelief forego his spiritual gifts, which are obtained only by faith in Christ. But while God has reserved to himself the mode and measure of temporal reward for filial veneration of father and mother, the distinction of the fourth commandment, as being the first in point of promise, remains undisputed as a special inducement to dutiful children to a more cheerful observance of this commandment.

Col. 3, 20: *Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord.*

In vv. 18—25 of this chapter, and v. 1 of the next, the apostle inculcates the domestic virtues, the proper conduct of wives and husbands, children and parents, servants and masters. In each case he addresses the inferiors, wives, children, servants, first, and the superiors, husbands, fathers, masters, next. In our text he speaks to the children, τὰ τέκνα, and the virtue he enjoins upon them is obedience, not to fathers only, but τοῖς γονεῦσιν, to the parents. This filial obedience is to be κατὰ πάντα, concerning all things. This is the rule. It is not for children to choose whether they would obey or not, but in all things, great or small, they are not to consult their own inclinations but comply with a parent's will. This is the nature of obedi-

ence, and in accordance with the rule. The exceptions, according to Acts 5, 29, are understood. To offer an inducement to cheerful obedience, especially where it may impose selfdenial, the apostle adds the words: *Τοῦτο γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ*, *for this is well pleasing in the Lord*. The text does not say, *TO the Lord*, which would be *τῷ κυρίῳ*, as the Elzevir text has by way of uncritical emendation. Filial obedience is here described as an ornament fair and pleasing to behold among Christians, a beautiful token of true godliness. The same sentiment is more explicitly set forth Phil. 4, 8, where the apostle says: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Prov. 23, 22: *Hearken unto thy father that begat thee, and despise not thy mother when she is old.*

According to a well-known *parallelismus membrorum* the meaning of this text is: Hearken unto thy father and thy mother who have begotten thee, and do not despise them when they have grown old. The text combines the two injunctions, one of which is laid down in each of the two preceding texts, Eph. 6, 2, which would lead children to *honor*, and Col. 3, 20, which would induce them to *obey*, their parents; and as filial veneration is often neglected when parents have grown old and subject to the frailties of old age, a special admonition to the children of such parents was deemed needful by the Spirit of God for the sake of both parents and children.

1 Tim. 5, 4: *To requite their parents: for that is good and acceptable before God.*

The infinitive, ἀποδιδόναι, is governed by *μανθανέτωσαν*, and the subject is τέκνα καὶ ἐκγόναι, *children and grand-*

children, who are here admonished to show piety (εὐσεβεῖν) toward their parents and grandparents who are of their household, and thus to requite their πρόγονοι, to *repay* in a measure what parents and grandparents have done for them in former years. But this is a duty often neglected even among Christians, and Christian children in riper years must learn this lesson (μανθανέτωσαν); and to incite us to heed his admonition the apostle adds: Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, *for this is acceptable before God*. The words καλὸν καί, found in early editions, are spurious according to A, C, D, F, G, the testimony of ancient versions and fathers; they were carried over probably from 1 Tim. 2, 3. That the fulfillment of filial duties is acceptable before God should induce Christian children to do with all faithfulness what filial gratitude toward their greatest benefactors should suffice to prompt them to do.

Hebr. 13, 17: *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.*

By τοῖς ἡγουμένοις, which the English Bible has rendered, *them that have the rule over you*, the pastors of congregations are designated as *leaders*. They march at the head of the congregations, who are to follow their example, and especially their doctrine, whereby they lead or guide the flock of Christ in the ways of God. The obedience and submission of Christians toward their pastors should be commensurate with the leadership of their ministers, which is exercised by sound doctrine and good example 2 Thess. 1, 8; 3, 14. Rom. 6, 17.—Phil. 3, 17. 2 Thess. 3, 9.—1 Pet. 5, 2, 3.—The reason (γάρ) why such obedience should be rendered, is given in the following words, *For they watch for your souls*. The souls of Christians are endangered by enemies, by ravenous wolves, and when faithful pastors perform the duties of their office, especially when they warn

their flock against false doctrine, the wiles of Satan, and the allurements of the world, and their warnings and admonitions are not heeded and obeyed, those who refuse to hear and heed them are in imminent peril of their souls. Or should pastors accommodate themselves to the obstinacy and waywardness of their people and decline to watch and warn while they know *they must give account?* Indeed, they might be tempted to neglect their duties when they see that their word is left unheeded or even resented by obstinate resistance. But if by painful experience, performing the works of their office with grief and not with joy, they should be discouraged from the faithful fulfillment of their pastoral duties, that would be unprofitable to the congregation and its members, and might result in the loss of their souls.

Rom. 13, 1: *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.*

This text inculcates due submission to civil rulers and magistrates. They are here called ἐξουσίαι, *powers*; for it is essential for a government to be a power, able to fulfill the fundamental purposes of civil governments, to afford protection to the members of the body politic. They are described as ἐξουσίαι ὑπερεχούσαι, *superior powers, obrigkeitliche Mächte*. It is immaterial in what person or persons this superior power may be vested, whether in a monarch, or in a collegiate government, or in the people at large; wherever a sovereign government is established it is the duty of every soul subject to such superior power to acknowledge the superiority of those who are and rule in power. *For*, says the apostle, *there is no power but of God*. Governments, though established by men, represent a divine institution for the maintenance of order in human society. And thus, as St. Paul continues, *the powers that be are ordained of God*, they are God's ministers, Rom. 13, 6, and Chris-

tians are not exempt from civil duties, but are to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, Matt. 22, 21.; and while the ungodly submit to civil laws for selfish reasons, Christians will submit themselves to every ordinance of men for the Lord's sake, 1 Pet. 2, 13, knowing that by God kings reign and princes decree justice, Prov. 18, 15, and that it is he who removes kings and setteth up kings, Dan. 2, 21, even though such kings may be ungodly, as Nero was in the days of St. Paul. For even a corrupt government is better than no government at all, and an anarchist is not only an enemy of human society, but also a rebel against God.

Lev. 19, 32: *Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head and honor the face of the old man.*

This text is followed by the words, *And fear thy God: I am the Lord.* The admonition to venerate old age is not a rule of politeness and good manners only, but an utterance of the holy will of God, and, therefore, a commandment which is binding upon young people at all times, and which cannot be set aside without offending God. To rise up before the hoary head is but one of many ways in which the veneration we owe to the aged may be exercised in demeanor, words, and deeds; and such conduct is well pleasing in the sight of God.

Acts 5, 29: *We ought to obey God rather than men.*

This text is part of the answer given by Peter and the other apostles to the high priest and the captain of the temple and the chief priests at Jerusalem, men who administered not only the religious but also the municipal affairs of the city, but who had forbidden the apostles to teach in the name of Jesus. Here, then, it was proper for the apostles to set aside the will and commandment of the civil rulers in order to obey the will and commandment of Him who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. And

thus all Christians should know that obedience to those who are in power under God must cease where such obedience would be or imply a transgression of a clear commandment of God, even when such refusal to obey human superiors would bring upon the inferiors temporal punishment, persecution, and even a violent death. It should be noted, however, that children and subjects are not emancipated from their filial and civil duties when parents or rulers in a given instance exceed their authority and demand what God has forbidden and forbid what God has enjoined. Though in such instance the inferior must disobey man in order to obey God, he still remains an inferior, bound to obey his parents and rulers in all things which they may rightfully demand.

A. G.

(To be continued.)

Historical Theology.

THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

II.

That historical theology, to deserve its name, must be historical, and that the study of church history must be the acquisition of historical knowledge, and first of all, of correct notions of historical persons, institutions, and events, has been shown in an earlier article.¹⁾ But historical theology, in order to deserve its name, must also be theology, and the study of church history is therefore the study of theology with a view of acquiring that practical habitude which constitutes a theologian, inasmuch as theology comprises a knowledge and proper discernment of the rise, progress, and preservation of the Christian Church and of its institutions, and an aptitude to utilize such knowledge in the promulgation, application, and defense of divine truth.

One of the requisites for the pursuance of such study as a study of theology is a theological interest in the subjects about which the theological student as a student of church history must be concerned, and in the purposes which a theologian as a theologian must have in view. It is true, the study of church history is frequently pursued without the proper theological interest and, perhaps, in some instances, without any interest at all, or only because Ecclesiastical History has, by those who have laid out the course of studies for the theological student, been given a place in such curriculum, and, more especially, because at a final examination a certain amount of historical knowledge will be looked for before a testimonial of maturity for the ministerial office can be granted. To this lack of in-

1) THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. II, pp. 425 ff.

terest it is largely due that from the minds of many their historical acquisitions have mostly disappeared after a few years of ministerial work, very much as many medical practitioners have but a very superficial knowledge of Anatomy after a few years of professional practice. In short, interest in the subject studied is an indispensable condition of successful study, the enduring acquisition of knowledge stored away, not *in futuram oblivionem*, but for future use.

But here again it must be remembered that even a true and warm interest in the subjects to be dealt with in church history is not necessarily theological interest. A jurist may be very deeply interested in the trial of Jesus and the various trials of Paul from a purely legal point of view. He may scrutinize the Gospels as he would the Annals of Tacitus and the Biographies of Suetonius, to inform himself as to the modes of legal procedure in the Roman Empire, the peculiar relations of local and national law, of ecclesiastical and civil courts and the limits of their jurisdiction, the taking of evidence, the relations of legislative, judicial, and executive power, the evil effects of mixing up politics with the administration of justice, and other points for which the history of those earlier days may afford analogies to the substantive and adjective law of our time and country. As a specimen of historical composition dealing with subjects with which a theologian should be familiar, determined by an interest not theological, we give the following extracts from Ramsay's recent work on St. Paul, the result of a very careful and thorough investigation of the Acts of the Apostles from the author's point of view.

"Several other facts show clearly that, during the following four years, Paul had considerable command of money. Imprisonment and a long lawsuit are expensive. Now, it is clear that Paul during the following four years did not appear before the world as a penniless wanderer, living by the work of his hands. A person in that position will not either at the present day or in the first century be treated with such

marked respect as was certainly paid to Paul, at Caesarea, on the voyage, and in Rome. The governor Felix and his wife, the Princess Drusilla, accorded him an interview and private conversation. King Agrippa and his Queen Bernice also desired to see him. A poor man never receives such attentions or rouses such interest. Moreover, Felix hoped for a bribe from him; and a rich Roman official did not look for a small gift. Paul, therefore, wore the outward appearance of a man of means, like one in a position to bribe a Roman procurator. The minimum in the way of personal attendants that was allowed for a man of respectable position was two slaves; and, as we shall see, Paul was believed to be attended by two slaves to serve him. At Caesarea he was confined in the palace of Herod; but he had to live, to maintain two attendants, and to keep up a respectable appearance. Many comforts, which are almost necessities, would be given by the guards, so long as they were kept in good humor, and it is expensive to keep guards in good humor. In Rome he was able to hire a lodging for himself and to live there, maintaining, of course, the soldier who guarded him.

“An appeal to the supreme court could not be made by everybody that chose. Such an appeal had to be permitted and sent forward by the provincial governor; and only a serious case would be entertained. But the case of a very poor man is never esteemed as serious; and there is little doubt that the citizen’s right of appeal to the Emperor was hedged in by fees and pledges. There is always one law for the rich man and another for the poor; at least, to this extent, that many claims can be successfully pushed by a rich man in which a poor man would have no chance of success. In appealing to the Emperor, Paul was choosing undoubtedly an expensive line of trial. All this had certainly been estimated before the decisive step was taken. Paul had weighed the cost; he had reckoned the gain which would accrue to the Church if the supreme court pronounced

in his favor; and his past experience gave him every reason to hope for a favorable issue before a purely Roman tribunal, where Jewish influence would have little or no power. The importance of the case, as described in the preceding section, makes the appeal more intelligible.

“Where, then, was the money procured? Was it from new contributions collected in the Churches? That seems most improbable, both from their general poverty, from Paul’s personal character, and from the silence of Luke on the point. Luke himself was probably a man dependent on his profession for his livelihood. His name is not that of a man of high position. There seems no alternative except that Paul’s hereditary property was used in those four years. As to the exact facts, we must remain in ignorance. If Paul hitherto voluntarily abstained from using his fortune, he now found himself justified by the importance of the case in acting differently. If, on the other hand, he had for the time been disowned by the family, then either a reconciliation had been brought about during his danger (perhaps originating in the bold kindness of his young nephew), or through death property had come to him as legal heir (whose rights could not be interfered with by any will). But, whatever be the precise facts, we must regard Paul as a man of some wealth during these years.

“He appeared to Felix and to Festus, then, as a Roman of Jewish origin of high rank and great learning, engaged in a rather foolish controversy against the whole united power of his nation (which showed his high standing, as well as his want of good judgment). That is the spirit of Festus’s words, ‘Paul! Paul! you are a great philosopher, but you have no common sense.’”¹⁾

And again: “It is doubtful why Paul’s trial was so long delayed. Perhaps his opponents, despairing of obtaining his condemnation, preferred to put off the trial as long

1) Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 310 ff.

as possible; and there were then, as there are now, many devices in law for causing delay. Perhaps the case was being inquired into by the Imperial Office: the trial had to take place before the Emperor or one of his representatives (probably one of the two Prefects of the Praetorian Guard). The whole question of free teaching of an oriental religion by a Roman citizen must have been opened up by the case; and it is quite possible that Paul's previous proceedings were inquired into.

"The trial seems to have occurred toward the end of A. D. 61. Its earliest stages were over before Paul wrote to the Philippians, for he says, I 12, 'the things *which happened* unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the Good News; so that my bonds became manifest in Christ in the whole *Praetorium*, and to all the rest; and that most of the Brethren in the Lord, being confident in my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear.' This passage has been generally misconceived and connected with the period of imprisonment; and here again we are indebted to Mommsen for the proper interpretation. The *Praetorium* is the whole body of persons connected with the sitting in judgment, the supreme Imperial Court, doubtless in this case the Prefect or both Prefects of the Praetorian Guard, representing the Emperor in his capacity as the fountain of justice, together with the assessors and high officers of the court. The expression of the chapter as a whole shows that the trial is partly finished, and the issue as yet is so favorable that the Brethren are emboldened by the success of Paul's courageous and free-spoken defence and the strong impression which he evidently produced on the court; but he himself, being entirely occupied with the trial, is for the moment prevented from preaching as he had been doing when he wrote to the Colossians and the Asian Churches generally.'"¹⁾

1) Ibid. pp. 356 f.

And once more: "At his second trial the veil that hides his fate is raised for the moment. On that occasion the circumstances were very different from his first trial. His confinement was more rigorous, for Onesiphorus had to take much trouble before obtaining an interview with the prisoner (II *Tim.* I 17): 'he fared ill as far as bonds, like a criminal' (II 9). He had no hope of acquittal: he recognized that he was 'already being poured forth as an offering, and the time of his departure was come.' The gloom and hopelessness of the situation damped and dismayed all his friends: at his first hearing 'all forsook' him; yet for the time he 'was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.' In every respect the situation thus indicated is the opposite of the circumstances described on the first trial. *Phil.* occupies the same place in the first as II *Tim.* in the second trial; but *Phil.* looks forward to a fresh career among the Churches, while II *Tim.* is the testament of a dying man. In one respect, however, the second trial was like the first. Paul again defended himself in the same bold and outspoken way as before, expounding the principles of his life to a great audience, 'that all the Gentiles might hear.'

"Yet the circumstances of this second trial are totally different from that 'short way with the dissenters' which was customary under Domitian and Trajan and later Emperors. After his first examination Paul could still write to Asia bidding Timothy and Mark come to him, which shows that he looked forward to a considerable interval before the next stage of his trial. He was charged as a malefactor, crimes had to be proved against him, and evidence brought; and the simple acknowledgment that he was a Christian was still far from sufficient to condemn him, as it was under Domitian. It is a plausible conjecture of Conybeare and Howson that the first hearing, on which he was acquitted and 'delivered out of the lion's mouth,' was on the charge of complicity and sympathy with the incendiaries, who had burned Rome in 64; and the charge was triumphantly dis-

proved. The trial in that case did not occur until the first frenzy of terror and rage against the supposed incendiaries was over; and some other species of crime had to be laid to the account of the Christians charged before the courts. The second and fatal charge, heard later, was doubtless that of treason, shown by hostility to the established customs of society, and by weakening the Imperial authority.

“If our conception of the trial is correct, the precedent of the first great trial still guided the courts of the empire (as we have elsewhere sought to prove). It had then been decided that the preaching of the new religion was not in itself a crime; and that legal offences must be proved against Christians as against any other subjects of the empire. That was the charter of freedom (p. 282) which was abrogated shortly after; and part of Luke’s design was, as we have seen (p. 307), to record the circumstances in which the charter had been obtained, as a protest against the Flavian policy, which had overturned a well weighed decision of the supreme court.”¹⁾

All this, however highly we may appreciate the labors of so high an authority on certain topics of Christian Archaeology, is certainly not historical theology. The very title of Dr. Ramsay’s book indicates that he deals with “St. Paul, the traveller and Roman citizen,” and not with “Paul, the apostle of Christ.” And while his work is highly instructive in various ways, also to the student of church history, the student, in order to capitalize the book for his theological studies, must contribute what the author of the book does not and would not furnish, theological interest. In this respect historical theology does not hold an exceptional position as distinguished from other aspects of theology. The study of dogmatical, exegetical, and practical theology may likewise be pursued without true theological interest, and in the absence of this interest a man

1) Ibid. pp. 360 ff.

may have passed through a full course of what should have been theological studies, without having become, in any true sense, a theologian.

What, then, is that theological interest, without which the study of church history cannot be theologically pursued? It is that frame of mind which St. Paul describes, saying: *I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified,*¹⁾ and: *I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*²⁾ The subject concerning which the theological student of church history must endeavor to make himself familiar is the Church of Christ from its origin to the present time, the Church of Christ, which is at all times built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone,³⁾ which is at all times and everywhere to be found where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name,⁴⁾ where there are those who continue in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers,⁵⁾ and who make disciples among all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever Christ has commanded them.⁶⁾ The theological student of church history will, therefore, investigate his sources of information for reliable *data* concerning the course of the Gospel among the Jews and the Gentiles, through countries and continents, decades and centuries, from the day when in many tongues the wonderful works of God were spoken at Jerusalem,⁷⁾ to the present time, when, according to Christ's promise, the Gospel of the kingdom is being preached in all the world for all the nations.⁸⁾ And since it is the Gospel of Christ by which the Church is built and preserved, the theological student will endeavor to learn in what measure the preaching of the

1) 1 Cor. 2, 2.

4) Matt. 18, 20.

7) Acts 2, 11.

2) 1 Cor. 9, 22.

5) Acts 2, 42.

8) Matt. 24, 14.

3) Eph. 2, 20.

6) Matt. 28, 19. 20.

Gospel, and especially the promulgation of the doctrine of justification, the *doctrina stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, was carried on at various times and in the various parts of the earth. Thus he will learn from the Acts of the Apostles and their writings that in the apostolic age Christ crucified and risen from the dead and forgiveness of sins in his name was the great cardinal subject of the earliest teachers of Christianity. But, at the same time, he will also find that false doctrines were very early disseminated even in the churches of earliest Christianity, and that the doctrine first assailed was the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith in Christ Jesus. He will further note that in the early churches the struggle of the spirit and the flesh was manifest in various ways, and that the corrective and preservative employed by the ministers of Christ was again the written and spoken word of divine doctrine, by which faith and love were fostered and made to bring forth fruits of the spirit for the glory of God. Passing from the Apostolic Age, in which the Gospel was spread and the Church of Christ planted and strengthened throughout the greater part of what was then the civilized world, the student would find, that in the days of the Apostolic Fathers the written and spoken word of God continued its course. He will find in Clement of Rome the doctrine of justification laid down in words as these: "All, then, were glorified and magnified, not by themselves or by their works, or by deeds of righteousness, which they had done, but through his will. And we, too, having been called through his will in Christ Jesus, are justified not by ourselves nor by our wisdom, or understanding, or godliness, or works which we have done in holiness of heart, but by faith, by which Almighty God had from the beginning justified all, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."¹⁾ But on the other

1) Πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν καὶ ἐμεγαλίνθησαν, οὐ δι' αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας, ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιοούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ

hand, the very scarcity of such golden words as these in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers will bear evidence to a deplorable decadence of the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in Christ very soon after the apostles of Christ had gone to their reward. And at the same time the ascendancy of Gnosticism with its false Theology and Christology and Soteriology and Eschatology, the sprouting forth of Sabellianism and other unitarian heresies, indicated most energetic efforts of Satan to counteract the saving influence of the Gospel by a multitude of blows directed against the very heart of Christianity, endeavors to obscure and ultimately to eliminate the doctrine of our salvation and to substitute for Christ, unto Jews a stumbling block, and unto Gentiles foolishness, a man-made savior who could not save, and for saving faith the vainglorious wisdom, the wild speculations of rationalistic errorists too numerous to count and too various to classify. But from the writings of such defenders of the faith as Irenaeus, and from what is left of the arguments of the *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις*, the student will also learn that the Christians of their age still demanded the law and the testimony where they were expected to give a hearing to those who would be their teachers, that the written word of God was looked upon as the infallible source of doctrine and norm of life. Thus also will the history of persecutions by the rabble of heathen cities and by the police power of the heathen state under the Roman emperors reveal the uncompromising endeavors of Satan to stay the progress of the Gospel, to silence its preachers, to stamp out Christian faith, to wrench from the hands of Christian people the written word of God, and to reestablish pagan worship where Christianity had reared its pulpits and its altars. But no less will the history of these persecutions give testimony to the Gospel of Christ as the

τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων, ὧν κατεργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοῦ ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτης Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν· ὃ ἔστω ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. *Ἀμήν.* I. Clem. ad. Cor. XXXII.

power of God unto salvation, whereby Ignatius, and Polycarp, and Sanctus, and Maturus, and Attalus, and Blandina, and all the glorious host of martyrs, were made victorious champions of Christ, testifying to him in the power of faith from scaffolds and pyres, in dungeons and chains and the jaws of wild beasts in the arena, and proving that all the enginery of hell was not sufficient to prevail over the simple and childlike faith of men, women, and children, upheld by the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Again, the theological student of history will, as he proceeds to investigate the Constantinian and post-Constantinian age, see Arianism and Nestorianism, Eutychianism and other heresies, rear their heads as so many monsters again assailing the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, the doctrine of Christ, the God-man, who alone could be the Redeemer of a sinful world. He will note the united efforts of emperors and councils and metropolitan bishops and conflicting parties to graft a rank growth of false doctrine on the withering trunk and branches of the church in spite of the valiant testimony of Athanasius and the learned Cappadocians and other witnesses of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, which had been handed down from the days of the apostles and shone forth from the more sure word of prophecy in a dark place. Thus the struggle of light and darkness continues through the ages, the fearful struggles of the Culdees on the British Isles and the European continent, of the Waldensians and Wycliffites, of John Hus and his friend Jerome, against antichristian Rome and its secular and ecclesiastical champions and serfs, antichristian chiefly because of its antagonism against the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Jesus, the only Savior from sin and death and the power of the devil. Toward the close of those dark ages the theological student will witness the rise of Humanism, not to make war against, but to join hands with, antichristian Rome, darkness resuscitated from the tomb of antique heathendom, with the

darkness conjured from the pit of hell by the first-born of Satan, for the purpose of forever extinguishing the light of the Gospel. And then, after a long reign of darkness, all the more hideous in its contrast with such rays of light as beam forth from the writings of that remarkable preacher, the best and greatest man of the Middle Ages, Bernhard of Clairvaux, the theological student of church history will behold the glorious victory of the everlasting Gospel in the days of the Reformation, when, to the dismay of antichristian Rome and under the frowns and scowls and vociferations of Humanism, God himself restored to his church, so long enthralled in darkness, the light of the Gospel and made the doctrine of justification to gladden the hearts of thousands and millions as it flooded forth with richness and purity unknown to the nations since the days immediately succeeding the Apostolic Age. And yet, after so glorious a victory, the struggle did not cease. The theological student, in his course through succeeding centuries, will witness Enthusiasm, Antinomianism, Synergism, Syncretism, Pietism, and Rationalism taking their turns in a long series of assault against the truth of God, and again chiefly against the doctrine of grace and faith and justification by faith as the central and cardinal doctrine of the Christian religion and of sound Christian theology, while at the same time antichristian Rome, after the failure of the Jesuitical counter-reformation with all its carnage and pillage, still endeavors to repair its battered and crumbling citadel under the leadership of a so-called infallible Vicegerent of Christ.

The reader will understand that in the brief space at our disposal we have only endeavored to give in a few outlines a perspective of what will chiefly attract the attention of a student of church history whose ruling interest is theological in kind and purpose. The doctrine of the Gospel is the source of life to the Church, and the well-being and prosperity of the Church is always and everywhere in proportion to the influence of such doctrine, the Church being

essentially the whole number of believers on earth, and faith coming by hearing and hearing by the word of God. The efforts of Satan and his entire kingdom of darkness against the church of Christ will, as a matter of course, be directed against that by which the church must stand and without which it must fall, and, on the other hand, the church militant can make a good fight against all its enemies only by the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. Knowing and considering this, the theological student of church history cannot but be eminently interested in whatever the sources of History may have to say concerning the doctrine of grace in Christ, its preachers and teachers, its promulgation and dissemination, its struggle with heresies and sin in all their multitudes of forms and phases, its victories and conquests, its decadences and adulterations, its restorations and ascendancies throughout the periods of History. Without this interest determining the study of Ecclesiastical History, the History of the Church is a book of seven seals, an unintelligible mass of confused and confounding phenomena, a vast expanse of hieroglyphic inscriptions for which the key has been lost, and the study of church history an unprofitable and misleading pursuit, which had better be let alone entirely or left to the hands of lawyers and political economists and others who do not profess to survey the field with a view of acquiring theological knowledge, but rest content with having secured what the theologian could well afford to leave unhandled or to lay aside as of comparatively little avail for his peculiar purposes.

Since, then, the theological historian will, first of all, seek Christ crucified, as in theology generally, so also in historical theology, and since, therefore, the Gospel of Christ and its promulgation and dissemination, its preaching and defence, will in all periods of history be the first and chief point of interest to him, it once more appears that a category of sources of historical information far too little esteemed and often left unnoticed by students of history must be con-

sidered of first importance. These sources are the doctrinal writings of the teachers of the church, from the Epistles of St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, down to the Postils of Dr. Walther. The history of preaching is a fundamental chapter of Ecclesiastical History and far more profitable, theologically, than the history of the persecutions and the Crusades and of the three great councils of the fifteenth century, and a few other chapters, taken together. The chief historical value of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, though they contain information on a variety of topics, lies in their doctrinal statements and their quotations from the Scriptures. What is most valuable in Justin's apologetical writings is his testimony for Christ the Savior and his information concerning the public worship in the church of his day, though what he yields by way of information concerning the Jews and Gentiles is not without its value. Irenaeus is one of our chief reporters on Gnosticism, and the better part of all we know concerning the Valentinians we know of him; and yet what is most valuable in his writings is again his testimony for Christ and his exhibition of Christian doctrine as drawn directly from the word of Scripture, and exhibited as the doctrine of the orthodox church of the second century. The writings of Clement and Origen are storehouses of information on many subjects; but the most important question the student may put to them is again: What think ye of Christ? Athanasius, the great champion of orthodoxy in his day, is rich in reliable information concerning the Arians and their wiles and ways, concerning the persecutions suffered by the defenders of the Nicene Creed at the hands and under the edicts of Christian emperors and the decrees of synods. But what is more noteworthy in his writings is his exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and their theological substantiation by the word of Scripture. The sermons of Basil and the Gregories, the catechetical lectures of Cyrill of Jerusalem, and the homiletical writings of Chrysostom, are sources of

information rarely noticed by most students of History, and yet more important than Tacitus and Suetonius and Ammian and Zosimus and all the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* in a heap. Again, to come lower down in the course of History, the *Regula Pastoralis* of Gregory I, which became and remained the chief handbook of pastoral theology throughout the Middle Ages, is a most important historical source, and more so by what it does not than by what it does contain. The work very clearly shows that the pastor who was shaped and who performed his pastoral duties according to this rule was not chiefly a preacher of the Gospel and a teacher who would make wise unto salvation. The greater part of the work bears the superscription: *Qualiter rector bene vivens debeat docere et admonere subditos*, and the first sentence of the *Prologus* runs: Since, then, we have shown, what the qualities of the pastor should be, let us now point out how he should teach.¹⁾ The first chapter consists of a summary of the subsequent chapters, which, according to this synopsis, contain nothing but *admonitions* directed to various classes of hearers. *Aliter namque*, says Gregory, *admonendi sunt viri atque aliter feminae, aliter juvenes, aliter senes, aliter inopes, aliter locupletes, aliter lacti, aliter tristes, aliter subditi, aliter praelati, aliter servi, aliter domini, etc.* In accordance herewith the superscriptions of chapter 2 to chapter 35 begin with *Quomodo admonendi*, and the chapters themselves with: *Aliter admonendi*, and the doctrine which runs throughout this entire *Regula Pastoralis* is a doctrine of works and not a doctrine of faith. Even where he speaks of Baptism, it is not properly God's sacrament, but man's repentance which, according to this blind leader of the blind, blots out sins.²⁾

1) Quia igitur qualis esse debeat pastor ostendimus, nunc qualiter doceat demonstramus.

2) Qua igitur mente, qui transactas culpas flere negligunt, vivunt securi de venia, quando ipse summus pastor ecclesiae huic etiam sacramento addendam poenitentiam credidit, quod peccata principaliter extinguit? Cap. XXX.

In like manner Winfrid, renamed Bonifacius by his lord, the Pope, and falsely bearing the epithet of "the Apostle of the Germans," bears testimony to the deplorable state of the Roman Church of his day in his sermons, which are again very rarely noticed by historiographers. They have a good deal to say of Winfrid's pilgrimages to Rome and his heroic combat with an oak tree, but fail to show that this so-called apostle was certainly not an apostle of Jesus Christ, the Savior of sinners, but a preacher of the righteousness of works, and of works not chiefly according to the law of God, but according to the commandments of the synagogue of Antichrist, a teacher who in his doctrine maintained profound silence concerning justification by faith, and led his hearers straightway to eternal damnation. Again, the sermons of St. Bernhard are among the most important historical documents of the Middle Ages, bearing most comforting evidence to the fact that even amid the shadows of mediaeval darkness Christ and his righteousness was still comfort and consolation to many a troubled soul. But the joy of the student cannot fail to be chilled, when from the selfsame sermons it appears that they were not directed to congregations of Christian people, men, women, and children, in their various ways of life, but to the inmates of a monastery, who, like the preacher himself, endeavored to seek their souls' salvation in seclusion from the world, and rejoiced in a light hidden under a bushel from the eyes of multitudes who might have been gladdened by what was best in the sermons of this great preacher of the Middle Ages, at the same time lord protector of antichristian popes and the victorious adversary of the most brilliant rationalist of his time, Petrus Abaelardus. Anselm of Canterbury, in his dialogue, *Cur Deus Homo*, exhibited himself as a witness to Christ the Redeemer and Savior of sinners, and as a father of rationalizing Scholasticism. Jean Charlier de Gerson, the illustrious chancellor of the mother of European universities, who did much toward the condemnation of John

Hus, became in his advanced years the teacher of little children, for whom he wrote his treatise: *De Parvulis ad Christum Trahendis*. Savonarola, one of the grandest preachers of all ages, must, of course, be studied in his sermons, which, while they are not entirely silent on Christ crucified, still exhibit the great Dominican as a thundering preacher of the law rather than a comforting preacher of the Gospel, and a political reformer rather than a restorer of Christian doctrine and of the faith in Christ Jesus. Great was Luther, the true Reformer of the Church, in his denial of the arrogant claims of antichristian Rome and his unsparing exposure of the fearful abuses of which even such enemies of the Reformation as Duke George of Saxony and Charles V were not wholly ignorant. But he who would picture the greatest theologian of post-apostolic times and the greatest champion of the liberty of conscience in these latter days as great only in negation, would draw a caricature instead of a portrait of the man. Luther must be studied in his commentaries and sermons and the thetical portions of his polemical writings as the great preacher of justification by faith, the doctrine of grace without works, which was the keynote of the Reformation and preeminently the sword of the Spirit by which this heroic champion of God's truth victoriously laid low and vanquished Antichrist and his minions arrayed against the Lord's anointed. Luther's burning of the papal bull and decretals has been slurred as a vain act of bravado by such as failed to hear or to understand the words which constitute the better part, the very soul, of this significant historical act: *Quia tu conturbasti Sanctum Domini, ideoque te conturbet ignis aeternus*. The great classical work of Martin Chemnitz, his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, was a crushing critique of the antichristian theology of Rome and its Jesuit retinue; but the real force and power of the blows dealt by the *Alter Martinus* lay precisely where the strength of the first Martinus must be sought, in the clear and incontrovertible thetical exhibition

of the doctrine of man's salvation as set forth in the word of God. And, to come down to a more recent period of History, Walther was an eminently talented controversialist and polemic; but it is significant that his most voluminous works are his Postils. For what he was to the Lutheran Church of our time and country, he was chiefly and primarily as the greatest teacher of the doctrine of justification in the present century, and perhaps since the days of the Reformation, who was never more eloquent than when he proclaimed Christ our righteousness and the grace of God in him. And thus throughout the various periods of Ecclesiastical History the theological student of History will best succeed, or; in fact, can only succeed, in making clear to himself and others the real character of historical persons and the true significance of historical events, if he pays proper attention to the presence or absence of the light of truth as it beams forth from the everlasting word of God. This is for all times the only infallible source of Christian doctrine and rule of life, and also the polar star by which the theological historian can at all times determine, even in the most intricate maze of historical phenomena, where he is, and whom or what, theologically considered, he has before him in the historical personages, institutions, and events set forth in the sources of historical information. Without this light he will find himself all at sea amid a bewildering confusion of really or seemingly conflicting historical evidence. It is because of their ignorance, neglect, or perversion of Christian doctrine, and especially of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, that modern theological historiographers grossly misrepresent such historical subjects as the church of the Apostolic Age, Athanasius, Nestorius, Augustine, Gregory VII and Popery in general, Humanism, Luther and the Reformation, Pietism, Schleiermacher, and Leo XIII. We iterate and reiterate, that the first and fundamental point of interest to the theological student of church history must be Christian doctrine, and

especially the doctrine of grace, the doctrine of justification by faith.

Having said what we have said, we are only consistent in going on to say that he only who is thoroughly familiar with Christian doctrine is fully equipped for the theological study of church history. We know that more is requisite; but the knowledge of Christian doctrine is indispensable. Dr. Ramsay has written a historical work on St. Paul of 394 pages, and probably no one but Dr. Ramsay could have written this work, for the simple reason, that there is probably no other man living who is so thoroughly and intimately familiar as Dr. Ramsay with what was foremost in this author's mind, the geography and topography of the countries through which Paul traveled, and of the cities in which he sojourned or dwelled, as also the political and social conditions prevailing in the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian era. And it was by this knowledge of what was his leading point of interest that he was enabled to write such a book. Where his information is not the result of his own original research, and hence not of a reliability for which he would be willing to vouch, he prefers to pass by in order to again put his foot where he feels at home. Thus where he might have dwelled more at length on what St. Paul experienced at Jerusalem and Caesarea he says, "On the details given of the incidences in Jerusalem and Caesarea I will not enter. I am not at home on the soil of Palestine; and it seems better not to mix up second-hand studies with the discussion of incidents where I stand on familiar ground." Thus Dr. Ramsay was eminently well equipped for writing a book on "*St. Paul the traveller and the Roman citizen.*" But while the work amply shows that it is largely based also on a careful study of the *Acts* and of St. Paul's Epistles, it is equally remarkable that there is in the entire work from cover to cover not one single theological statement. To write a theological biography on *St. Paul the Apostle* re-

quires an equipment far different from that in which Dr. Ramsay is strong, and the chief and most indispensable requisite for the composition of such a work is a thorough knowledge of the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, of the apostles and evangelists, and of the proper application of such doctrine in the Christian church and in the various ways of Christian life. The study of Biology requires long and careful practice in the use of the microscope. An uneducated eye will see little or nothing in many preparations placed under the most serviceable system of lenses, and even what the tyro sees is of little value to him. The circumstances of a case may be submitted in all its details, but only the trained mind of a lawyer will at once or after careful scrutiny perceive and properly estimate the strong or the weak points of the case which would probably decide its success or failure in court. And thus without a sufficient knowledge of the doctrines of the Christian religion the student of the History of the Christian church will in the course of his investigations fail to notice a great many things which ought at once to attract his attention; and even what did come under his notice he would under-rate or overestimate or otherwise misunderstand and misinterpret, group together what should be separated, and separate what should be placed in the same file. Thus the work of Dr. Dubose on the Oecumenical Councils is thoroughly unreliable and misleading, chiefly because its author is thoroughly unsound in Christian doctrine. To the student of mediaeval history who walks in the light of Christian doctrine Marsilio of Padua will appear not only as the physician of Louis of Bavaria and the staunch defender of his king against the decrees and anathemas of the Pontiff then residing at Avignon, John XXII, but his book, *Defensor Pacis*, will also show what is of far greater importance, that in the first quarter of the fourteenth century there were those who clearly knew and openly professed the scriptural doctrine concerning the authority and sufficiency

of Holy Scripture, the true doctrine of absolution, of the church and the ministry, and other doctrines which, if they had been generally known and accepted, must even then have broken down the stronghold of Antichrist. No one but a Lutheran theologian can write a life of Luther as it should be written, and it just as truly takes an orthodox theologian properly to perform the task which no Calvinistic theologian could properly perform, to write a theological biography of Calvin or John Knox. And thus in general it is not presumption to say that only an orthodox theologian possessing the remaining requisites for historical research is thoroughly furnished for the study of church history. For he alone, inasmuch as he thoroughly knows and truly accepts all the doctrines of Christianity in themselves and in their proper relations to each other, is in full possession of the criterion whereby all historical quantities can be properly rated and arranged as to their nature and historical importance and significance in the history of the Church of Christ, which is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, whose fortress and weapon of offence and defence is the word of Scripture, and whose chief task in the world is the preaching of the Gospel among all nations, whose prosperity depends upon and is betokened by the purity of doctrine abundantly and wisely dispensed by the stewards of God, and whose corruption and decadence is owing to and productive of corruption and decadence of doctrine in churches and schools and ecclesiastical literature. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that a Romanist, imbued with the doctrine of the Council of Trent, must first have ceased to be what that doctrine makes him, before he could begin to write a History of the Reformation or any chapter of church history without perverting historical truth, misinterpreting the records and in many other ways misconceiving and misrepresenting persons and institutions and events even where intentional falsehood may not be charged against him. D'Aubigne's History of the Refor-

mation is also unreliable in several respects, and certainly no Zwinglian or Calvinist will do justice to the German Reformation, since what is needful is not in him. No one can understand or correctly present the History of Pietism but a thoroughly sound Lutheran, to whose mind the true relation of Law and Gospel, faith and works, justification and sanctification, is perfectly clear, and it is necessarily a foregone conclusion that one who is himself in the dark concerning the *Malum Pietisticum* in its essential features is not the proper person to delineate a true portraiture of Pietism. In short, as there is but one true norm of doctrine and rule of life, which is true at all times and everywhere, so there is but one true standard by which all historical quantities can be reliably gauged, and that is the sound doctrine of Holy Scripture.

We know that what we have here outlined is looked upon by many as the height of presumption. We are told that historiography must above all be "impartial" or "un-biased." If this means that what is good and true should be so recognized wherever it is found, and that what is evil or false should be so set down wherever it is met, we are satisfied, and it is precisely for such impartial treatment of historical quantities that we must have the one true standard ever at hand and apply it with strictest impartiality. But every conscientious Lutheran writer of history will from various quarters be taken to task for having written from "an exclusive confessional point of view." With equal justice a revenue officer at a port of entry would be criticised for having gauged all the various articles imported from Germany and England and Japan and Brazil and the Philippine Islands from an exclusive American point of view, and according to American weights and measures only, instead of using yardsticks of different lengths for all the different fabrics coming under his hands. But as the revenue officer must not listen to such criticism, but stand by the instructions given him by his government and the

standards prescribed by this authority, so the theologian should abide by the law and the testimony, and rate according to this norm whatever he may meet on his way through the records of History from St. Luke's report of the birthday of New Testament Christianity to the historical accounts of recent events in the church of this world's eventide.

As an object lesson to demonstrate what the study of church history and theological historiography is apt to be without the knowledge and acceptance of the fundamental doctrines of Christian theology, we submit a few extracts from the *History of Dogma*, by Dr. Adolph Harnack, taken from the fourth volume of the translation of this work by Buchanan, published in 1898.

Speaking of Arianism and the doctrine upheld by Athanasius, the author says:

"How are the two mutually opposed doctrines to be judged from the standpoint of history, of reason, and of the Gospel? Each party charged the other with holding doctrines which involved contradictions, and, what is of more consequence, they mutually accused each other of apostasy from Christianity, although the Arians never advanced this charge with such energy as the opposite party. We have first of all to ascertain definitely how much they had in common. *Religion and doctrine are with both thoroughly fused together*, and, indeed, formally considered, the doctrine is the same in both cases, i. e., the fundamental conceptions are the same. The doctrine of the pre-existent Christ, who as the pre-existent Son of God is Logos, Wisdom, and world-creating power of God, seems to constitute the common basis. Together with this both have a common interest in maintaining the unity of God and in making a sharp distinction between Creator and creature. Finally, both endeavor to base their doctrines on Scripture and at the same time claim to have tradition on their side, as is evident in the case of Arius from the in-

troductio to the Thalia. Both are, however, convinced that the final word lies with Scripture and not with tradition." pp. 38 f.

Later on in the same chapter he says:

"Athanasius in making use of these presuppositions in order to express his faith in the Godhead of Christ, i. e., in the essential unity of the Godhead in itself with the Godhead manifested in Christ, fell into an abyss of contradictions.

"Unquestionably the old Logos doctrine too, and also Arianism, strike us to-day as being full of contradictions, but it was Athanasius who first arrived at the *contradictio in adjecto* in the full sense of the phrase. That the Godhead is a numerical unity, but that nevertheless Son and Father are to be distinguished within this unity as two—this is his view. He teaches that there is only one unbegotten principle, but that nevertheless the Son has not come into being. He maintains that the Divine in Christ is the eternal 'Son,' but that the Son is as old as the Father. This Son is not to be thought of either as created, or as an attribute of God, or as an emanation or a part of God, and is therefore something wholly indefinable. The thought of a theogony is rejected as emphatically as that of a creation, and yet the thought of an active attribute is not in any sense to be entertained. The Father is perfect for Himself and sufficient for Himself; indeed, although Father and Son have one substance, in the sense of a single nature, in common, still the Father alone is 'the God,' and is the principle and root of the Son also. *Quot verba, tot scandala!*

"Whatever involves a complete contradiction cannot be correct, and everyone is justified in unsparingly describing the contradiction as such. This the Arians sufficiently did, and in so far as they assumed that a contradiction cannot be seriously accepted by anyone, and that therefore the view of Athanasius must at bottom be Sabellian, they were right. Two generations and more had to pass before the

Church could accustom itself to recognize in the complete contradiction the sacred privilege of revelation. There was, in fact, no philosophy in existence possessed of formulae which could present in an intelligible shape the propositions of Athanasius. What he called at one time Ousia and at another Hypostasis, was not an individual substance in the full sense of the word, but still less was it a generic conception.

“If anything is clear, it is the fact that the thought of Athanasius—namely, the unity of the Godhead which rested in and appeared in Christ, could not be expressed under the traditional presuppositions of the pre-existing Son of God and the personal Logos existing from all eternity. We have here to do with the most important point in the whole question. The very same series of ideas which created the most serious difficulties for the Arians and which have been shown to occupy a secondary place in their system, seriously hamper the doctrinal utterances of Athanasius; namely, the Logos doctrine of Origen and the cosmological-metaphysical conceptions which form the background of statements regarding a historical person. The Arians required to have a created being, created before the world, changeable, of the same nature as men, for their Christ, and had to banish all other determinations from their conception, and so they could not make use of the Logos of Philo and the Apologists; Athanasius required a being who was absolutely nothing else than the Godhead, and so the Logos referred to did not in any sense fit in with his doctrine. *In both cases the combined Logos doctrine of Philo and Origen was the disturbing element.* And at bottom,—they both discarded it; Arius when he distinguishes between the Logos *nuncupativus* which Christ is, and the actual Logos of God; Athanasius when he banishes the world-idea from the content of the substance which he adores in Christ. In the view of Arius, Christ belongs in every sense to the world, i. e., to the sphere of created things; in that of

Athanasius he belongs in every sense to God, whose substance He shares.

“Arius and Athanasius both indeed occupy the standpoint of the theology of Origen which no one could now abandon; but their religious and theological interests do not originate in it. In the Gnosis of Origen everything spiritual stands to God in a two-fold relation; it is His created work and yet it is the same time His nature. This holds good in a pre-eminent sense of the Logos, which comprises all that is spiritual in itself and connects the graduated spheres of the spiritual substances, which, like it, have an eternal duration, with the supreme Godhead. To this idea corresponds the thought that the creatures are free and that they *must* return from their state of estrangement and their Fall to their original source. Of this we find nothing either in Arius or in Athanasius. In the case of the former, the sober Aristotelian philosophy on the one hand reacts against this fundamental thought, and on the other, the tradition of the Christ who is engaged in a conflict, who increases and progresses toward perfection. In the case of Athanasius what reacts against it is the ancient belief of the Church in the Father, the Almighty Creator of all things, and in the Son in whom the Father reveals Himself and has stooped to hold fellowship with man.

“It is thus not the case that the gnosis of Origen was simply halved between Arius and Athanasius; on the contrary, it underwent a fundamental correction in the teaching of both. But it was no longer possible to avoid the ‘*vis inertiae*’ of this gnosis of Origen, the contrary formulae which were held together by the idea of the Logos-cosmology as the basis for Christology. And now the question was which of the two was to be adopted, the Logos-κρίσμα or the Logos-ὁμοούσιος formula. The former freed from the latter was indeed deprived of all soteriological content, but was capable of intelligent and philosophical treatment—namely, rational-logical treatment; the

latter taken exclusively, even supposing that the distinction between the Son and the Father and the superiority of the Father were maintained in connection with it, simply led to an absurdity.

“Athanasius put up with this absurdity; without knowing it he made a still greater sacrifice to his faith—the historical Christ. It was at such a price that he saved the religious conviction that Christianity is the religion of perfect fellowship with God, from being displaced by a doctrine which possessed many lofty qualities, but which had no understanding of the inner essence of religion, which sought in religion nothing but ‘instruction,’ and finally found satisfaction in an empty dialectic.” pp. 46 ff.

In a foot-note referring to the opening words of the last paragraph: “Athanasius put up with this absurdity,” he adds:

“The Nicene Creed sanctioned it. One of its most serious consequences was that from this time onward Dogmatics were forever separated from clear thinking and defensible conceptions, and got accustomed to what was anti-rational. The anti-rational—not indeed at once, but soon enough—came to be considered as the characteristic of the creed. As there was everywhere a desire for mysteries, the doctrine seemed to be the true mystery just because it was the opposite of the clear in the sphere of the profane. Even clear-headed men like the later members of the school of Antioch were no longer able to escape from absurdity. The complete contradiction involved in the *ῥημοῦστος* drew a whole host of contradictions after it, the further thought advanced.”

Of Nestorius and his fellow-errorists Harnack’s study of church history has led to statements as these:

“But though we criticise the Christology of the Antiochians still more severely, we must not forget that *they held up before the Church the picture of the historical Christ*

at a time when the Church in its doctrinal formulae was going further away from Him. One has indeed to add that they also directed attention to the incomprehensible essence of the God-Logos which ostensibly remained behind this picture, and did not on that account possess the power of presenting the historical Christ to the minds of men in a forcible way. But still that these theologians should have done what they did at that time was of immeasurable importance. It is to them the Church owes it that its Christology did not entirely become the development of an idea of Christ which swallowed up the historical Christ. And there is still something else for which these Antiochians are to be praised. Although they professed to preserve the traditional elements of Dogma as a whole, they nevertheless essentially modified them by perceiving that every spiritual nature is a person and that what gives character and value to the person is feeling and will. This view, which was inherited from the Adoptionists and Paul, restores to the Christian religion its strictly spiritual character. But the Antiochians as Easterns were able to get possession of this knowledge only in a way which led from religion to moralism, because they based the spiritual on freedom, while again they understood freedom in the sense of independence even in relation to God. It was Augustine in his thought of liberty as *'adhaerere deo'* and as *'necessitas boni'* who first united the most ardent piety with the recognition of Christianity as the spiritual-moral religion. It is, however, worth remembering that alone of all the Easterns the Antiochians and the theologians who sympathized with them took an interest in the Augustinian-Pelagian controversy—though they undoubtedly sided with Pelagius. For this interest proves that spite of the Eastern fog of mysteries, they were accessible to the freer air in which that controversy was fought out." pp. 170 ff.

With another heresy condemned by the church our author deals, saying: "Monophysitism, which limits itself

to the statement that in Christ out of two perfect natures, divinity and humanity, one composite or incarnate divine nature has come into existence, and which will have nothing to do with the idea of a free will in Christ, is dogmatically consistent. It has indeed no longer the satisfying clearness of the Apollinarian thesis; it involves an additional mystery, or a logical contradiction, still in return for this it definitely puts into words the by no means unimportant element of 'perfect humanity.' But this Monophysitism, when directly formulated as *ἑνωσις φύσεως*, certainly made it plain to the Greeks themselves that it was no longer possible to reconcile the Christ of faith with the Christ given in the Gospels; for the idea of the physical unity of the two natures and of the interchange of properties, which Cyrill had worked out in a strict fashion, swallowed up what of the human remained in Him. Arrived at this point three possible courses were open. It was necessary either to revise the doctrine of redemption and perfection which had the above-mentioned statement as its logical result—a thing which was not to be thought of,—or else theologians would have to make up their minds still further to adapt the picture of the historical Christ to the dogmatic idea, i. e., to destroy it altogether, which was logical Monophysitism, or finally, it would be necessary to discover a word, or a formula, which would mark off the dogma of faith from Apollinarianism with still greater sharpness than had been done by the catch-word 'perfect humanity.' It was therefore necessary to intensify the contradictions still further, so that it was no longer the concrete union of the natures which appeared as the secret, but the conception of the union itself already involved a *contradictio in adjecto* and became a mystery. If it could be maintained that the natures had become united without being united, then on the outside everything seemed to be as it should be, and Apollinaris was as certainly beaten as Paul of Samosata—and this was maintained." pp. 179 ff.

In another chapter, in which he professes to give us "a Sketch of the History of the Genesis of the Orthodox System" we read:

"Athanasius was no follower of Origen; he was more akin to Irenaeus. In giving the central place to the thought of Christ's unity with God, and in carrying it out, he also set the theology of the future, it seems, on a new, or rather on the old Irenaeian basis. But he was no theologian, or, better, he ceased to be one from the moment when he perceived the central significance of the above conception of faith. He hardly touched, let alone solved, the problem of correlating it with all the other results of temporary knowledge, with the whole of natural theology. He had enough to do in showing that a conception still alien, at any rate to the majority, and clothed in an unfamiliar word, was scriptural, traditional, and fundamental, and in obviating objections. A kind of system was rather constructed by the strict Arians—Aetius and Eunomius—by means of Aristotelian philosophy. Every professed system up till past the middle of the fourth century was heterodox, with the sole exception of that of Marcellus; but while he made a bold front against the whole doctrine of Origen, he seemed to fall into long refuted errors. His fate itself proves that one thing, in whose assertion orthodox and Arians were agreed, was already inseparably bound up with the Christianity of the cultured, viz., the Neoplatonic doctrine of God and his revelation. The one party—the Arians—might supplement it with Aristotelianism, the other might give the widest scope to the conception of salvation embodied in Jesus Christ, but in the above fundamental thought both were agreed, and the common veneration of Origen is proof of this." p. 333.

Whatever all this may be, it certainly is not historical theology, nor is it theology, nor is it even history, but gross perversion of both history and theology. The author of this so-called History of Dogma, how learned and well-

informed he may be in various respects, is manifestly laboring under profound ignorance of the very nature of Christian Dogma; and thus it is that under his hand heresies become truths and truths heresies, both flowing from the same source. Mysterious doctrines of divine revelation become absurdities, sanctioned by an Oecumenical Creed. The greatest theologian of his day is pronounced no theologian at all, and confirmed heretics are made the benefactors of the church. And under the circumstances it could not be otherwise, except by a series of inconsistencies. Historical knowledge is to know, not only *that* persons and things were, but also *what* they were and *why* they were what they were. But to determine what Arius and Athanasius and Nestorius and the Nicene Creed really were is and must be beyond the grasp of Dr. Harnack as long as he lacks the chief equipment of a theologian and a theological student of church history, the knowledge and acceptance of even the rudiments of Christian doctrine.

But there is still another reason why the history of the church can be theologically studied only by a theologian who really is what that name indicates. Theology is a practical habitude of the mind, comprising also the aptness and willingness to instruct others in the knowledge of divine truth for the salvation of souls, and to defend the truth of God against its adversaries, and with this interest at heart, theology, also historical theology, must be theologically studied to secure theological results. The proper frame of mind for the successful study of medicine comprises an earnest desire to learn what is necessary for the practice of medicine or the education of others for medical practice. Without this interest to prompt his endeavors the student may perhaps acquire a certain amount of anatomical and physiological knowledge, but he will not become truly a medical man. This is the reason why many who have secured the *Medicinae Doctor* find themselves very inadequately prepared for medical practice, and in fact begin to

study medicine in the proper spirit after the completion of their medical course, study the therapeutics of pulmonary diseases and rheumatism as they have never done before, since now their science is put to the practical test of which they thought too little when they were medical students; and not infrequently aspiring young physicians have after a few years of practice sought the lecture rooms and clinics of foreign universities, and there acquired what they had felt in need of. Thus also the theologian who studies Ecclesiastical History and knows what he is about will find in the records of former times and events the ailments under which the church in those days, and more especially the teachers of the church, or men considering themselves as such and so considered by others, have suffered, the efforts, successful or unsuccessful, which were made to cure such ailments, the fearful ravages made by heresies and abuses when they developed into epidemics spreading over great parts of the church, as in the days of which Jerome wrote: "*Ingemuit orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est,*" or when Popery had joined hands with the Black Death in the widespread destruction of body and soul, or when Rationalism brought spiritual starvation over millions. The science and art of war, to be profitable for military practice, must be studied as it is at West Point and Annapolis, or in the campaigns of domestic or foreign wars, not by reporters for the press, but by such as would by such studies habilitate themselves for the service in the army or navy of their country. The theologian, too, is to stand, and to lead others, in God's holy wars, and with this interest at heart the student of church history will go over the records of earlier days with a view of familiarizing himself with the tactics both of the enemies of Christ and of the defenders of his truth, the weapons of offense and defense used on both sides, the failures and shortcomings of the leaders and of the rank and file of the church militant, and the distressing consequences of such deficiencies; the

standards about which the followers of the captain of our salvation would rally, and the banners and watchwords whereby the enemies were and may to-day be known. In the various states of our Union agricultural schools are connected with the state universities, not for those who would become lawyers or musicians, but for such as would by the instruction and training offered there render themselves more highly fitted for agricultural pursuits, and it is with this calling in view, that the studies comprised in the curriculum of such schools should be pursued. The theologian is a worker in Christ's vineyard, and the church is God's husbandry. From the days of St. Paul and Apollos there have been those who planted and watered, while God gave the increase.¹⁾ But through all ages there was also the enemy who persistently sowed his tares among the wheat, and the study of church history is a journey through the fields on which God's harvests ripened, as sowing or watering was faithfully or less faithfully performed, and where thorns and thistles and weeds of many kinds endeavored to occupy the ground and change the garden of God into a brambly desert; and much that the student of church history hears and sees may teach him lessons which otherwise he would only learn by painful experience, perhaps very dearly purchased at other people's expense. Thus the history of the Reformation abounds with most valuable instructions for Christ's husbandmen in the church of the present day, and there is no period of the history of Christianity which is entirely void of such lessons. Yet, with all the profusion of opportunities to profit for the faithful performance of a theologian's duties, many have failed to benefit by what might have been theological study of church history, because they plodded their weary way through the centuries aimlessly and chiefly rejoicing in the progress they were making from the primitive church through the dark

1) 1 Cor. 3, 6. 7.

ages and the era of the Reformation down to the age of Rationalism in the eighteenth century, because they knew that the end of the journey was at last drawing nigh and their course of history almost complete when the milestones had begun to indicate the nineteenth century. On the other hand, theological controversies have frequently proved very powerful incentives to profitable historical studies, especially to those who found it their allotted task to take an active part in the defense of truths assailed by errors which disturbed the peace of the church in earlier days until they were exposed and overcome by defenders of the faith who have long since entered into their Savior's rest with the church triumphant.

A. G.

Practical Theology.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

The Sunday-school as it is now known the world over is a school for religious instruction, or, as one of the dictionaries defines it, a school, generally attached to some church, in which religious and Biblical instruction is given, especially to the young. As an institution the Sunday-school is not of divine ordinance. The ministry, or the pastoral office, is of divine institution.¹⁾ It is not only because of its necessity or expediency that congregations maintain the ministerial office in their midst, but because of the expressed will of God that his word should be preached and the sacraments should be administered, and not promiscuously by all, but by men who have been properly called and through that call constituted ministers of Christ, made overseers of the flock, by the Holy Ghost, to be pastors and teachers of the congregation.²⁾ This, however, that the ministerial office is of divine institution and is as such the only office ordained by Christ for and in his church, does not bar a congregation from making special provision for special wants arising in its midst or its environments. When in the church of Jerusalem difficulties concerning the distribution of alms threatened to disturb the peace of the congregation, the apostles did not meet the discontent which had arisen by words of reproof, but called the multitude of disciples together and recommended the appointment of assistants, who might to the greater satisfaction of the people perform some of the duties which had previously been incumbent on the twelve, and on such recommendation the first college of deacons was elected and "appointed over

1) Mark 16, 15. 16. Matt. 28, 19. 20. Eph. 4, 11. Acts 20, 28.

2) 1 Cor. 4, 1; 12, 28. Acts 20, 28. Eph. 4, 11.

this business." The word here rendered "business" in the English Bible, *χρεία*, properly means *want, need, necessity*. To meet a certain want, to provide for a present necessity, this auxiliary office was established by the congregation, not only in Jerusalem,¹⁾ but also in other churches of apostolic days,²⁾ where the same or similar wants rendered such assistants desirable and profitable to the well-being of the church or individual members of the congregation. And thus to-day, while every congregation is held to establish and maintain the ministerial office as by divine ordinance, every congregation is likewise competent to provide special measures for special wants. Where the pastor is able and fully sufficient to minister to the congregation and to all its members as they should be ministered to, there will be no need or use of such special provision, there being no want to be satisfied. When we have what we need there is no want, and when we have more than we need there is even abundance. Want, *χρεία*, is the lack of necessities.

Now, the term, necessities, stands not for a fixed but for a variable notion, concretely considered. "Things may be of a useful character, but the quality or quantity supplied may take them out of the character of necessities. Elementary text-books might be a necessary to a student of law, but not a rare edition of 'Littleton's Tenures' or eight or ten copies of 'Stephen's Commentaries.' Things necessary to a person in one station of life would not be necessary to a person in a different station; or, again, things not usually necessary may become so from the circumstances of infants. Medical attendance and expensive articles of food may be ordinarily dispensed with, but may become necessities in case of ill-health."³⁾ And another author says, "The wife's necessities are such articles as the law deems essential to her health and comfort, chiefly food, drink, lodging, fuel, wash-

1) Acts 6, 2—6.

2) 1 Tim. 3, 8; 5, 17. Rom. 12, 7. 8.

3) Anson, Principles of the English Law of Contract. p. 112.

ing, clothing, and medical attendance. They are to be determined both in kind and amount, by the means and social position of the married pair, and must therefore vary greatly among different grades and at different stages of society."¹⁾ Yet necessities of a person may be defined as all that is needful for the being and well-being of that person. The laws of the state deal with necessities chiefly with reference to married women and infants, or minors, inasmuch as the state is concerned about the temporal welfare of its members. But our spiritual nature, too, has its necessities, and about these it is the duty of the church, its ministers and its members, to concern themselves; and if the secular courts hold, that "food, clothes, medical attendance, and education, to use concise words, constitute the leading elements in the doctrine of the infant's necessities,"²⁾ Christians should certainly not exclude a sufficient allowance of spiritual food and careful religious instruction and training from the spiritual necessities of their children. And here it should be noted, that children are to be considered as *children* when their necessities are to be determined. Says Schouler: "It is readily perceived that what are necessities for a wife may not be equally necessities for a child, and what are necessities for young children may not be equally necessities for those who have nearly reached majority."³⁾ That a congregation has made ample provision for the necessities of its adult members does not preclude the existence of actual want, the lack of spiritual necessities, with regard to the lambs of the flock. To come to the point, no one will in full earnest, and knowing what he says, maintain, that an hour or two of even well administered religious instruction once a week to children is adequate provision for the proper education, the Christian instruction and training, of Christian children. One meal a week, and though it be a Sunday dinner, would mean starvation to the physical nature of the

1) Schouler, on the Law of Domestic Relations, pp. 77 f.

2) Ibid. p. 548.

3) Ibid. p. 547.

child. The spiritual nature of the child also requires food, sufficient spiritual nourishment, not only for the maintenance of spiritual life, but also for a healthy spiritual growth; and as that life and growth should be continuous, so also the distributions of spiritual nourishment should not be sporadic but frequent and regular, and if a child is free to fold its hands and say, "Give us this day our daily bread," that child is certainly entitled to a daily allowance of spiritual food at the hands of those to whom the care, not only for its body, but also for its immortal soul, has been committed. If this daily spiritual meal, properly prepared as for young children, can be served at home, very well, then let it be served according to the divine injunction to fathers to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.¹⁾

But whereas in all but a few exceptional cases this Christian instruction at home would be largely neglected, the proper measure to secure for the children what they may rightfully claim as spiritual necessities is to commit them to a Christian school, where they may be under the daily influence of the word of God and be, not sparingly but sufficiently, nourished with the milk of divine truth, that they may grow thereby,²⁾ as from their infancy they learn to know the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make them wise unto salvation.³⁾ Where this regular and continuous instruction and training in Christian knowledge is not counteracted but confirmed and completed in the Christian home with its wholesome influences, and by the benefit which also children may and actually do derive from the attendance upon the public worship of the congregation, a Christian child can not be said to suffer spiritual want, its necessities being appropriately and sufficiently supplied in measure and in kind. To make such provision for all the children of the church is the duty of every local con-

1) Eph. 6, 4.

2) 1 Pet. 2, 2.

3) 2 Tim. 3, 15.

gregation, inasmuch as the children are the lambs of the flock, for whom not only the parents but also the ministers and members of the entire congregation are in their measure responsible. On the other hand, where such provision is made by the establishment and maintenance of a well conducted parochial school and well conducted and well attended public services on Sunday, public catechization included, the children of the congregation can not be said to be exposed to want, the lack of necessities, and we can see no use in the world for a Sunday-school to the children of a congregation with a spiritual household as above described. On the contrary, we hold that a Sunday-school may, in various ways, prove detrimental to the welfare of the congregation and its children under such circumstances. We have deliberately mentioned attendance upon public worship as one of the measures by which the children of the congregation also should be spiritually benefited. It is part of their spiritual education that they accustom themselves to participate in public divine service with the congregation of God, to join in the songs of the worshipers and in the common prayers of the children of God, and to hear the preaching of the word which is able to save their souls. But unless great care be exercised on the part of the minister and the congregation, the Sunday-school is very apt to reduce the attendance of children upon public worship, and even the teachers of the Sunday-school are not seldom tempted to look upon their Sunday task as completed when they have done their work in their classes and perhaps follow up that work by visiting in the families of children who may have been reported ill. In this way the rising generation would not be educated for, but weaned and estranged from, the church, and this would not be profit but loss. Another danger with which the establishment of Sunday-schools in well equipped congregations may be fraught is this, that parents and other members of the congregation may be tempted to look upon the Sunday-

school as a substitute for the parochial school throughout the week, and a lack of interest in behalf of the parochial school and perhaps even the withdrawal of a number of children from the school may be the consequence. It is for these and other reasons, that well-furnished congregations with parochial schools and Sunday catechizations have deemed it wise to do without Sunday-schools, thinking that they and their children would do better without than with them. If such congregations be located in the country or in small towns where there is little or no missionary material to be considered and little danger of the children of the congregation being led away into other churches, we are fully agreed with those congregations.

But a Christian congregation is not only a spiritual family with its own spiritual household to provide for, but a solemn duty of the church and of every local congregation is the duty of preaching the Gospel also to those who are not yet under its influence, and to gather to the fold the stray sheep for whom Christ has shed his blood. Especially in the larger cities, and also in some small towns and country districts, the work of the congregations must be largely missionary work. And it is proper to-day as it was in the primitive church, that missionary work should begin at home, and should take its way from Jerusalem to Judaea, and from Judaea to Samaria, and thence beyond to the uttermost part of the earth. In all of our larger cities there are hundreds and thousands of children whose parents know of no duty but the temporal care of their little ones, and even that duty is often very insufficiently performed. And here we ask: Has the church any duty toward those children? We answer: Most certainly. Of course, our first efforts will go toward drawing as many as possible of these wayward little ones into our parochial schools. But in most cases we will fail of success. We may, however, and in very many cases will, succeed in securing them for Sunday-schools. The first Sunday-school

on American soil of which we find mention in historical records was established by a Christian gentleman in Charleston, S. C., who, together with a Christian negro, would instruct a number of ignorant colored people from 7 to 8 o'clock every Sunday morning. This was in 1753, long before Robert Raikes opened his Sunday-school in Gloucester, England, in 1780. But that Sunday-school, too, was a missionary enterprise, of which Mr. Rice of the *Sunday-school Union* says, "Business called him into the suburbs of that city in 1780, where many youth were employed in the pin- and other factories. His heart was touched by the groups of ragged, wretched and cursing children. He engaged four female teachers, to receive and instruct in reading and in Catechism such children as should be sent to them on Sunday. The children were required to come with clean hands and faces, and hair combed, and with such clothing as they had. They were to stay from 10 to 12, then go home; to return at 1, and after a lesson to be conducted to church; after church to repeat portions of the Catechism; to go home at 5 quietly, without playing in the streets." To throw open opportunities for such children, for children who would otherwise obtain no religious instruction at all, or who, at the very best, would drift into various other Sunday-schools, perhaps even those of rank infidels and anarchists, who have of late begun their missions in the larger cities, is a purpose which our city congregations should not underestimate. "Suffer little children to come unto me" is as truly a word of our Savior as any other utterance which may guide our Christian labors and endeavors. And if by opening Sunday-schools we can shed the glorious light of the Gospel into the hearts of perhaps hundreds of young children which we could otherwise never expect to reach, there is certainly a want, and a crying want, that is, a difference between demand and supply, as long as no provision has been made to reach these children. In fact, of

all the various missionary endeavors, the work among these little ones may prove most profitable to them and to the church militant and triumphant. This work can be carried on with least expense, and, if properly conducted, may prove a blessing to the congregation in various ways.

But here is the great question: How should a Sunday-school, established and organized chiefly for missionary work, be properly conducted? This is the problem for the solution of which a great deal remains to be done, and it may be that the Lutheran church has an opportunity before it for showing the way to others and inaugurating a system of Sunday-schools far more adapted to their purposes than the Sunday-schools have hitherto proved to be.

Before saying another word in behalf of Sunday-schools we would, however, once more emphasize that we have no word of approval, when congregations pride themselves upon their flourishing Sunday-schools, while they might have parochial schools throughout the week. Those poor negro people at Charleston, and those neglected and ragged factory children at Gloucester, were not to be had for Christian instruction during the working days of the week, and it was compassionate charity toward the miserable victims of spiritual neglect that prompted the Christian men who established the early Sunday-schools mentioned above. But shame or pity upon congregations which would treat their children like street-waifs and paupers, while they might provide for them as Christian children in fair circumstances should be treated. When in reports of Synods and other statistical publications we hear the praises of Sunday-schools sung, we are generally impressed as with a company of people hobbling about on crutches and praising the excellence of their hobbling sticks, while they might comfortably walk on their own limbs, as other people do who are sound in body and mind. There are those who will tell us, the Sunday-school is certainly better than no school at all. In some respects we doubt it; in others we

know it is not; but even in the sense in which the claim may be granted the apology for the institution is a sorry one indeed. If a heartless father should send his child out into a snowstorm with only a calico dress upon its body, while he might comfortably clothe it from head to foot, he would hardly justify himself in our mind by telling us that the calico dress was certainly better than no dress at all, at least sufficient in part to cover the child's nakedness. In some of the bottom districts of Illinois many farmers have of late years sowed clover, where they formerly sowed wheat; but we have never heard one of them boast of the crop of clover he had raised. These men know very well that what are now clover fields were years ago part of one of the richest wheat growing districts in the world, and that their efforts at raising clover are only due to the fact that the soil has by neglect and mismanagement been so impoverished, that wheat will no longer grow. In a similar way Sunday-schools were established in the Lutheran churches early in the present century, after the once flourishing parish schools had dwindled away or died out, and the Sunday-schools were in truth, and were known to be, a sorry makeshift for a squandered inheritance once handed down from better and earlier days. Let it not be said that the age of the parish schools is declining because the German language is no longer working as an incentive to their maintenance, and that the establishment of the English parochial schools must be considered feasible only in rare, exceptional cases. This is not true, and the facts are on record which substantiate the contrary, that with some earnest efforts English schools for Christian children can not only be established but also prosper and thrive under unfavorable circumstances. We hold that if German congregations with their conservative tendencies and associations were and are in need of Christian schools, English congregations are in twofold and perhaps tenfold need of such schools, in consideration of certain dangers to which they are far more

generally exposed than the German congregations were apt to be. We repeat it, a Lutheran congregation in ordinary circumstances with a Sunday-school, but with no Christian school throughout the week for its own children, treats the lambs of the flock as a set of spiritual paupers, whatever their parents may be, and has certainly no cause to point with pride to its Sunday-school.

On the other hand, we also repeat, that while the children of a Lutheran congregation should certainly be above the lot of spiritual paupers, such paupers may be, and frequently are, at the very doorsill of the church, and a congregation may be grossly neglectful of a solemn duty when it leaves the spiritual famine which stares them in the face unmitigated and unrelieved, while something might be done for the salvation of those famishing souls. And if the only measure by which these objects of Christian compassion can be reached is the Sunday-school, then let it be a Sunday-school with might and main, and a Sunday-school adapted to its purpose of performing missionary work among the neglected children outside of the church, which, like all missionary work, has spiritual paupers for its missionary material. A Sunday-school established for this purpose, being a missionary enterprise, is, of course, not intended for the children of the church. When philanthropic men and women of means open soup-houses for the needy, they certainly do not send their own children to take their meals in such institutions. That the Sunday-school is intended for missionary work should be understood by the congregation, old and young, and especially by the pupils of the parochial school, who should be made to understand that the Sunday-school is intended for children not so well cared for as they are, children who should be objects of their pity and Christian endeavors. The children of the congregation should know that the Sunday-school affords them, too, an opportunity for missionary work, inasmuch as they may succeed in drawing such as are by their parents denied the

blessings of a Christian school at least into the Sunday-school, which the congregation maintains for such poor children. The prosperity of a Sunday-school should not be rated according to its attendance including the children of the congregation, but according to its success as a missionary institution, and, consequently, according to its attendance from without the congregation; and if in a given case such material should prove beyond the reach of the congregation and its Sunday-school, it would probably be consistent to close this missionary institution because of a lack of material. But where such material is to be found, it should be attended to by old and young as missionary material, and not only the poor children who may be taken in to be fed from God's storehouse in the Sunday-school, but also their parents and other members of their families who may not already be in membership with some church. Thus the teachers of a Sunday-school may find many a golden opportunity to get into contact with people who have been estranged from the church or who had never been under Christian influences, but who may by invitation and encouragement be induced to visit the public services in the church at which their children attend the Sunday-school.

But in order that the Sunday-schools should properly operate as a missionary measure, the plan of organization and instruction should be laid out accordingly. As a missionary school, the Sunday-school must content itself with far less by way of religious instruction than is imparted in a school which is in operation throughout the week. Now, when we consider that even in our parochial schools the Small Catechism with an apparatus of explanations and proof texts and a selection of stories from the Bible, together with a selection of church-hymns, furnish the bulk of the material for religious instruction, it must appear preposterous to go beyond that in the Sunday-school. While, of course, the spiritual nourishment offered in the Sunday-school must be the same in kind with that furnished in the parochial school,

it must be far reduced in quantity, and also the form in which it is presented must be appropriate to the peculiar circumstances. Among these circumstances we would also mention the teachers. It is to be expected that the pupils of a Sunday-school will, as a rule, be very much less homogeneous than the Christian children in a parochial school, and hence it would be more difficult to instruct them in large classes. This will always necessitate or at least recommend a comparatively large number of teachers, and these teachers will, under ordinary circumstances, have to be recruited from among the riper members of the congregation, men and women, able and willing to devote an hour or two every Sunday to this kind of missionary work. That these workers or not trained teachers is not a defect in their Christian character, but certainly a fact which must not be overlooked, and the work in the Sunday-school should be so conducted that it can be successfully performed by faithful Christians without pedagogical training. For this reason and for several other reasons it is to be strongly recommended that the Sunday-school should lay the chief stress upon the transmission of Christian knowledge simply or chiefly by leading the pupils to commit to memory the small Catechism and a number of golden texts and of church-hymns or verses of such, and by acquiring a familiarity with the stories of the Bible history by having them read to them or by reading and re-reading them in the class and at home, so that the work of the teachers may be chiefly mechanical, consisting in reading to their classes, hearing their recitations, and allotting tasks to those who are beginning to help themselves. We are decidedly of the opinion that more elaborate courses of study, such as they are laid out in the various lesson leaves prepared for Sunday-schools, are nowhere more out of place than in the Sunday-schools, and the enduring results of the instruction imparted according to these aids are, as experience amply and painfully corroborates what must be apriorically surmised, very meager indeed.

In the Sunday-school more than in any other school the maxim, *Tantum scimus, quantum memoria tenemus*, should be a leading principle. The endeavors of the teachers and of the pupils should be constantly directed not only to the acquisition of the new lessons given out from Sunday to Sunday, but chiefly to secure possession of what has been previously acquired. The utmost care should be exercised that nothing be learned *in futuram oblivionem*, that what has been once acquired should become and remain an enduring possession, to have and to hold forever, as the deeds on real estate put it. To secure this, the greater and better part of the time given to the classes of a Sunday-school should be devoted to ever renewed repetitions, and while the exact and punctual committal of new assignments should be insisted upon by the teachers and duly acknowledged and appreciated where it has been duly performed, the pupils should be made to understand, that what is of greater importance and more highly appreciated is the proficiency exhibited in the reviews of earlier lessons. A boy who has committed to memory the multiplication tables, but, by the time he has learned that 9 times 9 is 81, has utterly forgotten that 3 times 4 is 12 and 6 times 5 is 30 will make but a poor arithmetician; and the Sunday-school pupil who had gone through the whole of Bible History and had passed a brilliant examination on the travels of St. Paul, but would not know on what day the sun was made, and confounded John the Baptist and John the Apostle, or made Nebucadnezzar one of the tribes of Israel, would be *prima facie* evidence of a mismanaged Sunday-school. A child, whether after brief or after long attendance, should carry away from the school, securely stored in its memory, all that it was made to commit to memory from the first day of its attendance, and its earliest acquisitions should be its most secure possessions, having been clinched and riveted in the memory by the greatest amount of repetition. This will further necessitate the exercise of wise restriction in

the amount of the material to be allotted to the various classes, not only from Sunday to Sunday, but throughout the entire year and the course laid out for the entire school. Restriction, it is true, can also be carried to excess; but if it must be admitted that by being given too little the children will profit too little, it must be emphasized that by being given too much they may profit even less or nothing at all; it is better to have learned ten texts and to know them all, than to have learned a hundred and not to know any.

It need hardly be said that the chief lesson-book for these Sunday-schools should be Luther's Small Catechism, in the preface of which its author has expressed the principles set forth above when he says: "Help us to inculcate the Catechism upon them, especially upon the young. Let those who are not able to do better take these tables and forms and set them word for word before the people in the manner following:—First, the minister should above all things avoid the use of different texts and forms of the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Sacraments, etc. Let him adopt one form and adhere to it, using it one year as the other; for young and ignorant people must be taught one certain text and form, and will easily become confused if we teach thus to-day and otherwise next year, as if we thought of making improvements. In this way all efforts and labors will be lost. This our honored fathers well understood, who all used the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments in one and the same manner. Therefore we also teach these forms to the young and inexperienced as not to change a syllable, nor set them forth and recite them one year differently from the other. Hence chose whatever form you think best, and adhere to it forever. When you preach among the learned and judicious, you may show your art and set these things forth with as many flourishes and turn them as skillfully as you wish; but among the young, adhere to one and the same fixed form and manner, and teach them, first of all, the

text of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, etc., so that they can say it after you word for word, and commit it to memory. . . . Secondly, when they have well learned the text, teach them the sense also, that they may know what it means. Again take the form of these tables or some other short fixed form of your choice, and adhere to it without the change of a single syllable, as was said of the text; and take your time about it; for it is not necessary to take up all the parts at once, but take one after the other. When they well understand the First Commandment, proceed to the Second, and thus continue; otherwise they will be overburdened, and be able to retain nothing well."

Beside and next to the Catechism, what is needed for these Sunday-schools is a selection of Bible texts, arranged in concentric courses, and a similarly arranged canon of verses from the hymn-book, all of which should be printed, not on separate slips or leaflets, but in a series of small books of strong paper or, still better, of muslin, so that from the long continued use of the same books the pupils may obtain enduring impressions upon their local memory, each text or verse holding and retaining its fixed place on the page or part of the page where it is printed, an advantage of great importance, which is neglected or lost by the practice of printing the material to be memorized on detached cards or leaves. In addition to these text-books, two or three concentric courses of stories from the Bible should be provided, illustrated if possible, and printed in clear type. And here we would recommend the plan followed by Huebner, of having the stories composed in brief sentences and an equal number of questions added, for each of which the corresponding sentence of the story is the complete answer. We do not generally approve of or recommend an apparatus of questions on the lessons of a school-book, where well-trained teachers are supposed to be the instructors. But this supposition, as has already been stated,

would hardly or rarely be justified in Sunday-schools, and for the pupils of these schools such questions may prove valuable aids to review in the class as well as at home.

For the analphabets, or what we may call the infant class, of a Sunday-school, we would recommend a series of well executed pictures, illustrative of the chief parts of the Catechism and a first course in Bible History, which might be used to good advantage in various ways and most profitably as aids in expeditious reviews, the pupils being made to point out in the picture or to name such objects as Adam and Eve, Kain and Abel, Noah and his ark, Abraham, Isaak, and Jacob, Joseph and Pharaos, Moses, Mount Sinai, and the tablets of the law, king David, Joseph, Mary, the shepherds and the angels in the night of the nativity, Jesus in his twelfth year, John the Baptist, John the Apostle, Peter, Judas Iscariot, Pontius Pilate, Paul the Apostle. Pictures, says Johannes Damascenus, are books to the illiterate.¹⁾ The words must, of course, be supplied by the teachers of these classes, who should dole out to their pupils in very small apportionments the text of the Small Catechism, i. e., the text of the Ten Commandments, without Luther's explanations, the text of the Apostles' Creed and of the Lord's Prayer, and the words of institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and relate or read to them the stories from the Bible selected for this course, using the pictures wherever they are available by way of demonstration, and, as has already been urged, in continual review of all the lessons of the course.

Beyond the helps hitherto enumerated, the equipment of the Sunday-school, as far as instruction is concerned, should not go, and all additions, however ingenious and practical they may seem, would prove, not beneficial, but detrimental, to the success of the Sunday-school. We are quite sure, that the more elaborate the customary lesson-leaves and similar aids for Sunday-schools have grown, the

1) Βίβλοι τοῖς ἀγραμμάτοις εἶσιν αἱ εἰκόνες. *De Imag. Orat. II.*

more scanty and shallow and evanescent the emolument of the joint labors of both teachers and pupils have proved to be. Of such paraphernalia of the modern Sunday-school as cards, juvenile periodicals, a circulating library, and other familiar accessories, we have little to say. We hold that the Sunday-school could do very well without them as a school and a missionary institution; but where they are deemed indispensable, let them be used as inducements to regular attendance and the faithful performance of allotted tasks, but in no case as incentives to ambition and self-aggrandizement or with a view of out-doing in this respect other Sunday-schools with whom we would compete.

As in all other enterprises where methodical and concerted action is of importance, the Sunday-school should be under the leadership, management and supervision of an able and responsible person, and that person is naturally and *ex officio* the pastor of the congregation, all the teachers of the Sunday-school being his assistants in the work which is properly the work of the Christian congregation. Where and when it is possible, the pastor should not only pay an occasional visit to the Sunday-school, but be regularly present as the supervisor of the work which is being carried on. He should not, however, be burdened with a class of his own, but pay attention to all the classes and their teachers and see that their work is faithfully and in every way properly performed according to the plan laid down for the entire school and the various classes. Especially should he from time to time examine the classes of the various grades, primary as well as advanced, and where he should find defects in the work of the teachers he should in a kind and considerate way draw the attention of his assistants to such defects, not in the presence of the classes, but after the adjournment of the school or, still better, in regular meetings of all the teachers of the Sunday-school, over which he should preside. The pastor should also conduct the opening and closing exercises of the entire Sunday-

school, and keep the congregation informed of the progress of this work of the church. Where circumstances will not permit the pastor to perform these various duties regularly or at all, he should be given an assistant superintendent of the Sunday-school, and the person probably best qualified for this position and most apt to enjoy the confidence of the teachers as well as the pupils would seem to be the teacher or one of the teachers of the parochial school. The teacher, being as a rule also the organist of the congregation, would also be the proper person to lead the singing exercises of the Sunday-school. These should consist chiefly in singing the hymns and melodies used in the public services of the congregation. Both the tunes and the text of these hymns are in every way superior to the modern Sunday-school songs found in the multitude of collections which have of late grown like mushrooms on the field of Sunday-school literature in an age which is certainly not an especially propitious climate for the production of church music and poetry. Besides, the Sunday-school should also in this respect keep in close contact with the church and endeavor to prepare its pupils for participation in the spiritual life of the church and in its various manifestations.

As the most appropriate time for the exercises of a Sunday-school we would recommend the hour immediately preceding the morning service of the congregation. Where special Sunday-school rooms have been provided, this hour can be retained throughout the year. Where the Sunday-school must be held in the auditorium of the church, it will be necessary to convene the classes half an hour earlier on communion Sundays, so as to avoid clashing with the preparatory service of the communicants. We give these morning hours the preference for several reasons, one of which is, that by utilizing these hours for the Sunday-school, the afternoon hours will be reserved for the public catechizations with the children of the congregation and in the presence of the adult members of the church, to whom these

catechizations will prove highly profitable. For their sake as well as in the interest of the children and confirmed young people of the congregation these catechetical afternoon services, or "Christenlehren," should in no wise be encroached upon by the Sunday-school. This is one more reason why the children of the congregation and of the parochial school should be led to understand, that they must not permit themselves to be drawn away from the catechizations intended chiefly for them and the congregation proper by attendance upon the Sunday-school intended for children of a different description. Even where circumstances do not appear to permit the performance of the Sunday-school work before the morning services and to recommend transferring it to the afternoon, the Sunday-school should not occupy the time which would otherwise be taken up by the traditional public catechizations. The classes of the Sunday-school should then meet at half after one and adjourn at half past two o'clock, when the "Christenlehre" should begin, and the pupils of the Sunday-school should make place for the children of the parochial school and the confirmed young people of the congregation. Of course, the members of the Sunday-school classes should not be expected to absent themselves after the adjournment of the Sunday-school proper, but they should on the contrary be encouraged to remain and to join in this catechetical afternoon service of the Christian congregation as hearers during the catechization, and to unite their voices with the worshipping assembly in the hymns of the congregation.

Having briefly discussed the nature, the personnel, and the methods and equipment of a missionary Sunday-school, a word or two on the end and aim to be kept in view by all those concerned in this work will not be out of place. The ultimate end and aim of all missionary work should be the salvation of souls to the glory of God; to gather sinners to the communion of saints made perfect in heaven. And this should also be the end and aim of the Sunday-school as a

missionary institution. But we know that no one will be in the communion of saints above who has not been of the communion of saints here beneath, the church of Christ on earth. No one will enter into the kingdom of glory but through the kingdom of grace. And we further know and should ever remember that the church of Christ on earth is ordinarily to be sought in the local congregation. Membership in the local congregation should, therefore, be contemplated for the children in and through our Sunday-schools, just as we carry on home and foreign mission among adults with a view of making them members of local congregations. In the first place, these children of the Sunday-school mission should not always remain paupers or poor relations, but should, if at all possible, be lifted on an equal footing with the gros of the children of families connected with the church. Every effort should therefore be made to induce the parents of our Sunday-school children to give them the greater benefit of religious instruction throughout the entire week, and earnest endeavors in this direction on the part of the teachers of the Sunday-school and of the pupils of the parochial school will in not a few cases prove successful. Thus the Sunday-school will be made a feeder for the parochial school, very much as the parochial school is, with proper management, a feeder for the church. And, furthermore, those who are interested in the Sunday-school and the parochial school should not keep their interest pent up in the schools and restricted to the pupils of the schools, but extend it beyond these members of families into the families themselves and to the rest of the members thereof, and especially also to the fathers and mothers of the children. The teachers of parochial and Sunday-schools may thus find many opportunities to lead into the public services of the congregation and finally to membership in the church the fathers and mothers of children who had been gained for the Sunday-school or the parochial school of the congregation.

A. G.

LENTEN SERVICES.

The observation of Lent dates back to a very early period of Christianity. It is not, however, our intention to enlarge upon the history of oriental and occidental customs and traditions connected with the ante-paschal fasts from the first beginnings of what we know concerning these observances to the close of the middle ages. And also when we speak of the observation of Lent in the Lutheran church, we consider the subject less from a historical than from a practical point of view.

The Lutheran reformation was, as in all other respects, on the whole eminently conservative also in dealing with the traditions handed down from earlier periods of the occidental church with regard to the weeks preceding the Easter season. The manifold and gross abuses which had taken possession of this season for a time seemed to recommend more radical changes, and in his *Formula Missae* of 1523 Luther recommended that the week before Easter should not be distinguished from any other week of the year, opposing even the omission of the *Hallelujah* in the services of this week, as during the entire Quadragesima. But on maturer deliberation he changed his view, and in his *German Mass* (of 1526) he says, "The Fasts, Palm Sunday, and the Passion Week we retain, not with the intention of compelling any one to fast, but in this wise, that the passion and the gospels ordained for this season shall remain." He recommends that the week be celebrated, not by total cessation of labor, but by daily preaching on the suffering of Christ, while he does away with the superstitious rites and ceremonies practiced under the papacy. And thus throughout the Lutheran church the various regulations of public worship all agreed in setting apart the lenten season, and, especially, holy week, as a time for special services, calculated to lead the worshipping congregations to a better under-

standing and appreciation of the passion of Christ and its significance. In accordance with Luther's recommendation referred to above, that "the passion and the gospels" should be retained, the traditional pericopes for the Sundays of the Quadragesima were left unchanged, and only the Pomeranian liturgy makes an exception by designating the narrative of the baptism of Christ for Quinquagesima Sunday and transferring the lessons properly belonging to Quinquagesima, 1 Cor. 13, 1—13 and Luke 18, 31—43, to Laetare Sunday. The old Agenda further agree in prescribing that during the Quadragesima the passion of Christ should be the subject of the secondary and weekday services throughout the Lenten season.

The texts for these sermons in common use were sections of the harmony of the gospel narratives of the passion of Christ, also handed down from earlier days, but revised by Bugenhagen. According to some of the liturgies the history was to be read and preached upon from the beginning to the end of the Quadragesima; according to others this was to be done once during the earlier part of Lent and once more during the latter part, especially during the week before Palmarum and throughout the holy week before Easter. Still other liturgies reserve the story of the passion of Christ for the latter week, and some other texts, as the story of the resurrection of Lazarus, John 11, for the weeks after Laetare and Judica. The Brunswick liturgy appoints the story of the resurrection of Lazarus for Friday after Judica and John 12 for Saturday before Palmarum, the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem for Palmarum, and the account of our Lord's suffering and death for the "Still Week," thus endeavoring to note the various events on the days on which they came to pass. In some instances, texts from the Old Testament, especially prophecies of the suffering Messiah, were recommended for these special passion sermons, while the reading and expounding of the gospel narrative was reserved for the week beginning with Palmarum.

That such observance of the lenten season is highly appropriate in the church and in good keeping with the idea of a church year, no one will seriously question; but opinions may differ as to what should be the general trend of the sermons preached in these passion services. Many have evidently endeavored to make these weeks a penitential period to be devoted chiefly to the contemplation of the sins of mankind, and of the worshiping congregation and individual especially, as the cause of Christ's suffering and death. With this end in view and the texts prescribed or recommended by church-books or tradition, preachers were largely led to exhibit the sufferings of Christ preponderatingly as evidence of the righteous wrath of God, by pointing out the various sins or categories of sins for which the suffering Savior might be said to have made atonement by certain sufferings which he was made to undergo at the hands of Jews and Gentiles, and by certain performances of active obedience, in Gethsemane, the High Priest's palace, the court of Pontius Pilate, on the *via dolorosa* and Calvary. The great defect of these sermons was in not a few instances this, that far more time and space was given to the consideration of the sinner and his sins than to the exhibition of the Savior and his atonement by his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross, and thus the suffering Savior was made to perform the work of Moses and the law, when more than at any other time he should be permitted to be the embodiment of the grace of God and the gospel of our salvation. We would not be understood to mean that every reflection on sin and the righteous wrath of God should be kept out of a passion sermon;¹⁾ on the contrary, we are alive to the fact, that redemption and salvation can not be preached or understood where sin and the thralldom of Satan and the wrath of God, wherefrom we are redeemed and saved, are not duly pointed out and properly rated and

1) Cf. Luke 23, 28. 31.

taken to heart. All this, however, can be very well exhibited and demonstrated by bringing into relief the multitudes of sin and heinous ungodliness and atrocious wickedness manifested by Judas Iscariot and Simon Peter and Hannas and Caiaphas and the rest of the priests and rulers and Jews, Pontius Pilate and Herod and the multitudes massed together in Jerusalem and about the cross of Jesus.

Others have endeavored to picture to their hearers the suffering Savior as the man of sorrow, stricken and afflicted, the despised of men, in a way to enlist in his behalf the compassion and commiseration and tears of the congregation, little thinking that in this they were rather repeating what Pontius Pilate did when he exhibited the bleeding and lacerated form of the Nazarene to the gaze of the multitude, saying, "*Behold the man.*" Again we are far from maintaining that the preacher must in no way or measure bring home to his hearers the truth that the body and soul of Jesus under the faithlessness of his disciples and the blasphemies of the High Priests and rulers, the buffetings and ignominies heaped upon him by their subordinates, the gross injustice of Pontius Pilate, the cruel scourge and crown of thorns, the excruciating tortures of the crucifixion, and the bitter pangs of death, were indeed an object which should not fail to move and melt even a heart of stone, and sufficient to call forth tears from the eyes, not only of the daughters of Jerusalem, but of all who may behold these sufferings, which stand unrivaled in the history of mankind. But where tears of compassion and pity are all that the preacher has elicited, he has achieved very little of enduring value and might fitly be reminded of the words of Christ directed to the weeping women, who bewailed and lamented him, "*Ye daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children.*" Emotional preaching has its use, and the Holy Spirit himself in the Psalms and in the Prophets, and Christ and his apostles, did not fail to take into account that the human heart is cap-

able of emotions and the human breast of sighs and the human eye of tears. But to stir up emotions merely or chiefly for the sake of producing such affect may be the aim of playwrights and actors, but is out of place in the pulpit everywhere, and especially in sermons on the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

In the days of rampant Rationalism the sufferings of Christ were a subject in little favor with many preachers, and where they preached lenten sermons at all, Christ was rarely exhibited as the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, but chiefly or exclusively as the virtuous wise man of Nazareth, who was true to his doctrine, even when it brought upon him the hatred of Pharisees and Sadducees, and who, in his suffering and death, set an example of steadfastness and humility and meekness and charity and loving concern for his frail disciples and his bitter enemies, eminently adapted to elevate the moral standard of those who walk in his footsteps. Others preferred to speak of Pilate's wife and the captain of the guard rather than of the suffering Jesus, and felt relieved when the season was over, as one of them candidly, though certainly not reverently, confessed, that he always breathed more freely, when "Christ once more had ascended into heaven." Still others more consistently dropped the passion services altogether, and thus managed to forego what was uncongenial to themselves and unprofitable to their hearers, many of whom, especially among the country people, would obtain what their preachers could not and would not give them, in the old parchment-bound postils and other books of devotion, in which their fathers had found true edification by the daily contemplation of their Savior's passion.

To be truly and enduringly profitable, passion sermons should, as all other sermons, be sound and solid expositions of what the evangelists have recorded or what the prophets and apostles have written concerning the vicarious atonement of Christ by his obedience unto death. They

should be in the best sense of the word doctrinal and didactic, since what is true of all Scriptures is preeminently true of those parts of the inspired word which treat of the work of our redemption, that they are profitable, in the first place, for doctrine, and that whatsoever things were written aforetimes were written for our learning. The lenten sermons should lead the congregations to a more thorough and intensive, as also a more extensive, knowledge of the doctrines of the person of Christ, the God-man, the divinely ordained High Priest, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and higher than the heavens, of his deep humiliation, of his self-sacrificing love toward sinful mankind, of vicarious atonement and our redemption from sin, Satan, death, and damnation, of justification by faith, of sanctification and the restitution of the image of God in the redeemed, of hope and patience under the cross and in the billows of death, and of life everlasting. The Law and the Gospel in their proper relation to each other, the doctrines of sin and of grace, should be the elements, as of all our preaching, so also of what we furnish forth to our hearers during the season of Lent. We know of no better summary of what these lenten sermons should inculcate than Luther's exposition of the second article of the Apostles' Creed in the small Catechism, and where the preacher in a given year intends to preach on texts of his own choice, it may not be amiss to follow this summary as a plan for an entire series of passion sermons, reserving the closing words for the keynote of his Easter sermons, in which he will make it a point to follow the example of the angel preacher at the empty sepulchre, who greeted the women of Galilee, saying, "Be not affrighted. Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him." Thus the resurrection of Christ will appear as what it really is, the divine acknowledgment of the validity and sufficiency of Christ's atoning sacrifice and the absolution of the world because of the redemption which is in Christ

Jesus. And here the inestimable value of a well prepared and well delivered series of passion sermons is once more manifest. No one can truly appreciate the significance of the risen Lord and Savior, who has not learned to know and to understand Christ crucified. It was only after the disciples, who had been slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken, had been led in a measure to understand in all the Scriptures the things concerning Christ, especially concerning his suffering and entrance into glory, that they began to rejoice in the risen Lord. Luke 24, 25—27. 32—34. And likewise did true and abiding Easter gladness enter the hearts of the eleven only after Christ had said unto them, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me," and after he had opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things." Luke 24, 44—48.

A. G.

SERMON ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SEASON OF LENT.

For the Sundays and festivals in the ecclesiastical year we have certain traditional texts, the epistles and gospels. But there are seasons in the ecclesiastical year requiring a special series of sermons and for these there are no texts prescribed or suggested. For the evening sermons in Advent and Lent the pastor must make his own selection of texts. Sometimes this is tedious work. It is not a wise policy to pick out texts at random, without any systematical

arrangement, and to say almost the same thing in every sermon. A faithful pastor will outline a certain course for the season and present to his congregation the divine truths to be proclaimed in that season in a systematical form.

We shall endeavor to give a few hints as to the arrangement of lenten sermons. The great subject of Lent is the Lord's Passion, the suffering and death of our Savior. In the lenten services the suffering, crucified, dying Christ should be presented to the congregation in His inestimable love to the whole sinful world. Not only the history of His suffering, death and burial should be told and enlarged upon, but the principal part is to show why Jesus had to suffer and die and what great benefits we derive therefrom. The hearers must be led to perceive that their sins have caused the Lord those terrible agonies of body and soul, to deplore their sins, and then to find comfort against sin and hope of eternal life in the wounds of Christ. "God hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." This is the great truth which every lenten sermon should impress on the mind, whatever its theme or subject may be.

We submit a number of sermon arrangements for the season of Lent under different headings.

I. The suffering and dying Lord at different places.

1. In the garden Gethsemane. Matt. 26, 36.
2. In the high priest's palace. Matt. 26, 57.
3. In Pilate's judgment hall. Matt. 27, 1. 2.
4. In the presence of Herod. Luke 23, 6—12.
5. In the streets of Jerusalem on His way to Calvary. Luke 23, 26—32.
6. On Calvary. Luke 23, 32. 33.
7. In the grave. Matt. 27, 59. 60.

II. Remarkable utterances of Jesus in His passion.

1. His appeal to the disciples to keep awake in Gethsemane. Matt. 26, 40. 41.

2. His explanation why the enemies were successful in capturing Him. Luke 22, 52. 53.
3. His advice to Peter. Matt. 26, 42.
4. His declaration under oath that He is the Son of God. Matt. 26, 63. 64.
5. His advice to the daughters of Jerusalem. Luke 23, 26—31.
6. His testimony concerning His kingdom. John 18, 33—36.
7. His confession, I am a King. John 18, 37.

III. Remarkable conduct of Jesus in His passion.

1. His silence. Matt. 26, 62. 63 and 27, 13. 14. *
2. His care for the disciples, preventing their apprehension. John 18, 4—9.
3. His remonstrance with the servant who slapped Him in the face. John 18, 22. 23.
4. His look upon Peter. Luke 22, 61.
5. His refusal to work a miracle. Mark 15, 29—32.
6. His refusal to drink vinegar mingled with gall. Matt. 27, 34.
7. His care for His mother, entrusting her to John. John 19, 25—27.

IV. Remarkable incidents connected with Jesus' suffering and death.

1. The angel appearing from heaven to strengthen Him in Gethsemane. Luke 22, 43.
2. The dream of Pilate's wife. Matt. 27, 19.
3. Choosing between Jesus and Barabbas. Mark 15, 6—13.
4. Casting lots for Jesus' garment. John 19, 23. 24.
5. Pilate washing his hands in protestation of his innocence. Matt. 27, 24.

6. The potter's field bought with the thirty pieces of silver for which Jesus was betrayed. Matt. 27, 6—10.
7. The issue of blood and water from the corpse. John 19, 33—37.

V. Prominent persons figuring in our Lord's holy passion.

1. Judas Iscariot. 2. Peter. 3. Annas. 4. Caiaphas. 5. Malchus. 6. Pontius Pilate. 7. Herod. 8. Barabbas. 9. Simon of Cyrene. 10. The dying thief. 11. Mary. 12. Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea.

VI. Persons who contributed to the suffering of our Lord.

1. Judas.
2. Peter.
3. The false witnesses.
4. Caiaphas.
5. Pilate.
6. The soldiers and servants.
7. The howling multitude.

VII. Persons who showed a friendly disposition to our Lord in His suffering and death.

1. Peter in the garden drawing the sword in his Master's defense.
2. Simon of Cyrene bearing Jesus' cross.
3. The daughters of Jerusalem bewailing Him.
4. Pilate's wife warning her husband.
5. The dying thief asking Jesus to remember him in His kingdom.
6. The centurion saying, Truly, this man was the Son of God.
7. Nicodemus and Joseph undertaking the interment.

VIII. Seven Words from the Cross.

1. Father, forgive them. Luke 23, 33. 34.
2. This day shalt thou be with me in paradise. Luke 23, 39—43.
3. Woman, behold thy son. John 19, 25—27.
4. Why hast Thou forsaken me? Matt. 27, 43—45.
5. I thirst. John 19, 28. 29.
6. It is finished. John 19, 30.
7. Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit. Luke 23, 46.

IX. What was done to Jesus to make Him suffer in His body.

1. He was bound and taken captive.
2. He was slapped in the face.
3. He was buffeted.
4. He was scourged.
5. He was crowned with thorns.
6. He was compelled to bear His own cross.
7. He was nailed to the accursed tree.

X. What was done to Jesus to make His soul suffer.

1. In Gethsemane He was made to feel the burden of the world's sins resting upon Him to such an extent that He was almost on the verge of despair praying that this cup might pass away, and the sweat issuing from His pores as drops of blood. Luke 22, 44.
2. He was left by all His disciples, who fled when He was taken captive and kept themselves at a safe distance during the trial. Matt. 26, 31.
3. He was betrayed by Judas and denied by Peter, His own disciples. Ps. 41, 9.
4. In the highpriest's palace His divinity was assailed and false witnesses were produced against Him. Matt. 26, 59—66.

5. In the judgment hall He was falsely accused. Luke 23, 1.
6. Before Herod He was mocked and put to public shame. Luke 23, 11.
7. By the soldiers and servants He was spitefully entreated, spitted on and put to ridicule. Matt. 27, 27—30. Mark 14, 65.
8. On Calvary He was reminded of His miracles and told that He could not help Himself. Matt. 26, 39—44.

XI. Attending signs showing nature's condolence with the dying Son of God.

1. The sun shrouded in darkness.
2. The earth quaking.
3. The rocks rent.
4. The graves opened.
5. The veil of the temple rent in twain.

XII. Rays of divine glory perceptible in the suffering and dying Christ.

1. At His simple Word the band headed by Judas and coming to seek and arrest Him go backward and fall to the ground. John 18, 3—6.
2. He heals Malchus' ear which Peter had severed from the man's body by the sword. Matt. 26, 51—54.
3. He restores Peter by the look of His eye. Luke 22, 54—61.
4. He declares Himself the Son of God and utters divine prophecy. Luke 22, 66—71.
5. It is made manifest that He is the Lord of nature when nature mourns His death. Matt. 27, 45.
6. He promises Paradise to the penitent thief. Luke 23, 39—43.
7. He expires with a loud cry showing that He does not die from exhaustion, but of His own will. Luke 23, 46.

8. Such is His power even in death that not only the centurion must bear record of His divinity, but the whole multitude smite upon their breasts. Luke 23, 47. 48.

XIII. The human heart disclosed by our Saviors suffering. (According to Tholuck "Light from the Cross.")

1. The history of our Savior's Passion makes manifest in *Caiaphas* to what a degree the human heart may harden itself against the truth. Matt. 13, 14. 15.
2. In *Judas* to what a degree it may harden itself against the truth, after once having known the way of righteousness. 2 Pet. 2, 20. 21.
3. In *Pilate* to what a degree it is capable of shallowness and vanity. John 18, 38.
4. In *Peter* to what an extent it may waver in its attachment to Him in whom it has confidently found the words of eternal life. John 6, 67—69. and Luke 22, 60—62.
5. In *Mary* what a human heart may become under the training and discipline of God. Luke 2, 34. 35.
6. In *Thomas* the Lord's Passion and resurrection makes manifest what may become of the human heart under the Lord's training and discipline. John 20, 29.

Similar arrangements may be made on the lines indicated. The full history of the Lord's Passion may be profitably discoursed upon in a chronological order. The history as given by a certain Evangelist may be followed and texts chosen from that Evangelist. Prophecies of the Lord's suffering and death may be selected from the psalms, or from the prophets, or from other books of the old Testament and their fulfillment shown in the Passion history. Any such plan is commendable.

Contributed by H. S.

Theological Review.

The Post-Apostolic Age. *By Lucius Waterman, D. D., with an introduction by Henry Godman Potter, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of New York. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. MDCCCXCVIII. XVIII and 505 pages. Subscription price, \$1.00.*

The author of this volume does not appear to be what might be called a professional historian, a scholar whose business it is to push his historical researches to the original sources of information, or as close to first sources as it is to-day possible to get. What he endeavored was to write an interesting book, and in this he has been in a fair measure successful. Some of his own leading interests are those of an Episcopalian, and while it is no more than proper that the history of the rise and growth of the post-apostolic episcopate should occupy considerable space in a work covering the second and third centuries, the author's point of view is apparent in his dealing with this subject with more breadth than depth. On the other hand certain features of prime importance in a critical narrative of events and a detailed portraiture of men who have left their indelible imprint on the history of post-apostolic Christianity have not received the attention to which we would consider them entitled at the hands of a historiographer with as much space at his disposal as our author has enjoyed. Thus we fail to find a historical analysis and clean cut delineation of the political, social, and intellectual conditions and circumstances which influenced the progress of oriental and occidental Christianity of the second and third centuries, of Gnosticism, the methods and arguments of such men as Celsus, Lucian, Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, the decadence of doctrine, especially of the doctrine of justification and divine grace, as early as the age of the Apostolic Fathers, etc. We cannot agree with the author when he says:

"To sum up all, the first period of the Church, the Apostolic Age, is a period of immaturity and preparation,—one might almost say, of infancy. The third period, that of the Councils, is one of much corruption, though also, thank God, one of noble and greatly effectual resistance to corruptions. The second period, the period described in this volume, is—not the best, surely, in the Church's story. One who really believes in the power of the indwelling Life of Jesus Christ as a leaven and in the guiding of the Holy Ghost must certainly regard the Church of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a far *better* Church than the Church of the second and third. Not the best, then, but—the purest of all that the Church has known. It will show us, in the serious judgment of the writer of these lines, the thought and purpose of our Saviour Jesus Christ, less modified by the natural thoughts and feelings of the men who are trying to assimilate his thoughts, than any following age. Many earnest souls to-day are not only filled full with the prejudices of Post-Reformation thought in its nineteenth century Protestant form, but accept them uncritically as if there were fixed standards of Divine Truth. Such will feel a shock in reading of some of the thoughts and practices of the Church of the very first century after the Apostles, the Church of the pupils of St. John." pp. 10 f.

With this estimate of the relative merits of apostolic and post-apostolic times, with this astigmatism in the author's theological and historical eye, it is small wonder that the pictures he obtains and which he projects on his pages are in a measure blurred and distorted. We candidly confess that we, too, feel a shock, not only "in reading some of the thoughts and practices of the Church of the very first century after the apostles," but also when we meet such statements as those embodied in the extract above submitted. We can never read the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, of Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, without experiencing a pang as we turn page after page and many a page before we meet one of the comparatively few passages which speak of the great cardinal doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, in more than a passing way, and in a manner which clearly indicates, that the writer knew that he was then and there setting forth the *doctrina*

stantis et cadentis ecclesiae, the doctrine by which preeminently Christianity is distinguished from all the false religions. And again we are provoked every time when we read what Ignatius has to say concerning the episcopate of his day, and the correspondence between Cyprian and the Roman clergy, who are also laboring under the prevalent perversion of the ministerial office, which, in spite of them all and of Polycrates of Ephesus and of Firmilian of Caesarea, finally resulted in a full-grown antichrist.

What we have said does not, however, prevent us from cordially appreciating much of what we find in this volume. We can not say that we are fully satisfied with what the author tells us concerning Gnosticism; but we take pleasure in giving him credit for saying:—

“For us in these modern times there is a further gain in the calling up of this Gnostic nonsense of seventeen or eighteen centuries ago. It shows us how little of the spirit of the age can be trusted to meet the religious needs of the age. Gnosticism was folly, but it was not the work of fools. It represents the best work that some of the best minds of that age could do in providing themselves with a religion, when God’s religion did not suit them. Our age is another age of restlessness, of fanciful speculation, of religion-making. Again an enormous value is set on knowledge, on education. Again men are looking for a religion that can meet their wants. The old religion which alone succeeded in meeting men’s needs in the second and third centuries, will alone meet any real needs of the nineteenth century, or even of the twentieth.” p. 207.

We find in the tracts and letters of Cyprian considerably more material for refuting the arguments based upon Cyprian’s writings by the Romanists, and a more thoroughly critical and exegetical treatment of the tract *De Unitate Ecclesiae* will lead to a more precise delineation of Cyprian’s notions of the unity of the church and of the episcopate and a more stringent and cutting presentation of Cyprian’s testimony against Rome. Yet what Dr. Waterman says in the following extracts is in the main so good, that we can not withhold them from our readers.

"The great Roman idea of settling controversy and saving unity is that all the rest of the Christian world should submit to the guidance of the bishop of Rome. Cyprian not only does not foresee the necessity for such a government of the Church, he provides beforehand against the possibility of it. 'There is one episcopate,' he says, (*Letter* li. 24), 'diffused through the harmonious multitude of many bishops,' and in *De Unitate* (v.), 'The episcopate is one, it is a whole in which each enjoys full possession.' His Latin phrase runs thus, '*Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*' The idea is that the authority of each bishop, as Dr. Benson puts it, a 'tenure on a totality.' One might use a more familiar law term, and render the phrase, 'The episcopate is a single property, in which each holder holds one undivided part.' A bishop might be, must be, put out of his office by action of his peers, if he were found guilty of heresy or immorality. As long as he retained his office, however, he held it as the direct representative of the Lord Jesus Christ, and he was responsible for his administration of it to Him alone. If great questions came up in an episcopal council, a majority of votes could not override a minority. If even in the greatest practical questions, after ninety-nine bishops had agreed in adopting a rule of action, one single bishop dissented from it, he was at liberty in Cyprian's idea, to rule his diocese in his own way. He was only not at liberty to break away from the fellowship of his brethren, nor they from him. If one bishop—for instance, the bishop of Rome—excommunicated another bishop because of a difference in practice, the excommunicator excommunicated only himself. Rome would save unity through uniformity by having all bishops submit to one. Cyprian would save unity through free diversity, by having all bishops respect one another's high responsibility, and simply agree to disagree. Even bishops in councils did but give advice and come to agreements. They did not pretend to be able to make *laws*, for a bishop was subject only to Jesus Christ.

"Yet Roman authors quote very striking testimonies from Cyprian, some of which he really wrote. Does he not say that the unity of the Church begins from Peter and from Peter's see? Well, no! Not in the modern Roman sense. What he does say is that our Lord gave the keys to St. Peter first to show by a symbolic action that the Church was one, and its authority a single, undivided authority everywhere. Then He gave precisely the same gift to all the Apostles alike. 'On him being one He builds His Church, and though He gives to all the Apostles an equal power, and says, *As My Father hath sent Me*, . . . yet in order to manifest unity, He has by His own authority so placed the source of the same unity as to

begin from one. Certainly the other Apostles were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honor and of power, but a commencement is made from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one.' 'He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith?' So Cyprian goes on presently. 'He who strives against and resists the Church, is he assured that he is in the Church?'

"But let it be well observed that no superior power is asserted as having been given to Peter above other Apostles. On the contrary, it is distinctly set down that they have in every way as much as he. He is the symbol, not the necessary centre, of the unity of authority in the Church. Just because this language was not satisfactory to the advocates of later Roman claims, a forger added certain telling phrases to this passage. After 'a commencement is made from unity,' he added, 'and primacy is given to Peter, that the Church may be set forth as one, and the see as one. And they all are shepherds, yet the flock is shown to be one, such as to be fed by all the Apostles with unanimous agreement.' Again, after 'He who strives against and resists the Church,' is added, 'He who deserts the see of Peter, on whom the Church is founded.' These additions — the proof that they are forgeries is overwhelming — mark just the difference between the Cyprianic view and the Roman. In the late Roman view bishops must govern their Churches 'by unanimous agreement;' in the Cyprianic they are free to differ. In the Roman view, leaving the chair of Peter is separating one's self from the Church; we shall presently find Cyprian separating himself from the Roman bishop in a great matter, and taking the ground that if he is excommunicated for it, the Roman bishop will be the only one hurt." pp. 387 ff.

"In May, 254, Stephen was chosen bishop, and Stephen and Cyprian were men foredoomed to clash.

"The first matters that divided them came in the form of appeals from foreign Churches. A foreign Church in any trouble or perplexity naturally appealed to its greater neighbors for help. Carthage and Rome were both, and equally, appealed to by the clergy and laity of Legio and Emerita, now Leon and Merida, in Spain. The former bishops, Basilides and Martial, had both lapsed in a former persecution, had been deposed and even excommunicated. They had accepted their sentences, and new bishops had been elected and consecrated in their places. Of late they had roused themselves from their dejection, had claimed their old positions, and Basilides at any rate had made a journey to Rome, and there made such representations that Stephen had admitted him to

communion, and sent to the Spanish Churches a direction, request, counsel, — we know not what, — that Basilides and Martial be in all respects restored. This subject coming before Cyprian's fifth Council of Carthage, in September, 254, the thirty-seven bishops joined in a letter (lxvii.) in which they assure the Spanish Churches that they ought not to give way for a moment." pp. 399 f.

"From Gaul comes in another complaint. Marcian, bishop of Arles, is a Novatianist. He not only refuses the 'peace' to penitents, in cruel disregard of the general agreement of the Churches, but he acknowledges Novatian as rightful bishop of Rome. The neighboring bishops in Gaul consider this a scandal, and ask Cyprian for advice and help. Hence we have a letter (lxvi.) from Cyprian to Stephen, telling the new bishop of Rome what he ought to do in the matter. The 'pope of Carthage' fairly orders his Roman brother to rouse himself from negligence and play his proper part. 'It is our duty,' says the letter, putting Carthage quite on a level with Rome in the matter, 'It is our duty to consider this affair, and to remedy it,' and again, 'It is for this end, dearest brother, that the body of the bishops is great and generously multiplied, knit fast with glue of mutual concord and bond of unity, that so, should any of our college attempt the forming of a heresy, the rending and wasting of Christ's flock, the rest may come to the rescue.' " p. 401.

"But even in North Africa a general carelessness had prevailed, — it was that, rather than a generous wisdom, — and now that the question was brought up again, Cyprian adopted the narrow line as a decision of the Church in better days, and threw himself into the defense of it with all possible intensity. A council of thirty-two bishops, Cyprian's fifth council, assembled at Carthage in 255, adopted a letter drafted by Cyprian as an answer to a request for advice received from eighteen bishops in Numidia. In the following spring there was another council of seventy-one bishops, representing both Africa and Numidia. These confirmed the previous decision, and adopted a form of letter to be sent to Stephen at Rome, calling his attention to the conclusion reached among them and asking his cooperation. With this letter were enclosed copies of the answer of the preceding council to the Numidian enquiry, and a letter of Cyprian to Quintus, a bishop in Mauretania. A committee of bishops went to Rome to confer with Stephen face to face, and it must have been by their hands that these communications were conveyed.

"Did they know already what Stephen's opinions were? It is altogether probable. And Stephen, on his side, had already heard

of the outrageous innovation on old Church policies which his colleague of Carthage was urging so powerfully. There were bishops in Africa who took the opposite side from Cyprian, and would not come to his councils to be outvoted, and probably they had been prompt to tell their story to their sympathying Roman brother. But the bishops from Carthage were quite unprepared for the reception which awaited them beyond the sea. The bishop of the sister Church absolutely refused to receive them. He would grant them no interview, public or private. He directed the Roman Christians to show them no hospitality, no courtesy. He sent, indeed, a letter in answer to that of the Carthaginian council, but it was in what men have learned to consider a truly Roman manner, vouchsafing little argument, magnifying the chair of Peter, and actually denouncing holy Cyprian as 'a false Christ, a false Apostle, and a deceitful worker.' He proceeded further to send a communication to the bishops of Eastern Asia Minor, who had for some time adopted the rule of indiscriminate re-baptism, declaring his intention not to hold communion any further with Churches in which this rule was kept.

"Such a threat was a challenge to the whole Catholic Church to assert what were held to be true principles of order, and the challenge was promptly met. Outside of Rome, the three chief bishops of that time were Firmilian of the Cappadocian Caesarea, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Cyprian of Carthage. Each one of them took a decided stand against this Roman aggression. Firmilian addressed to Cyprian a letter still preserved to us in the collection of Cyprian's correspondence (lxxiv.), in which he echoes Cyprian's arguments at great length, and then turns upon Stephen in a spirit of independence, to say the least. 'Of none more than of you,' so the bishop of Caesarea addresses Stephen, — 'Of none more than of you does Divine Scripture say, *A wrathful man stirreth up strifes, and a furious man heapeth up sins.* For what strifes and dissensions have you stirred up throughout the Churches of the whole world. Moreover, how great sin have you heaped up for yourself, when you cut yourself off from so many flocks. For it is yourself that you have cut off. Do not deceive yourself, since he is really the schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For while you think that all may be excommunicated by you, you have excommunicated yourself from all.'

"'It is yourself that you have cut off.' 'You have excommunicated yourself alone.' St. Firmilian's words show that he regarded Stephen's threat as having been carried into execution, and the communion of Rome with Caesarea and with Carthage as already actually suspended; but they show also that Asia Minor cares no whit

for such a condemnation, save to mourn the fall from grace and peace of the furious 'bishop of other men's affairs' who pronounced it." pp. 406 ff.

In an earlier chapter the Doctor makes the following pertinent remarks on a much abused passage in Irenaeus:—

"It will be sufficiently clear that Irenaeus regarded the essentials of Christian doctrine as proved by a tradition which could not possibly admit error, being (1) *universal*, and because universal, (2) certainly *unbroken in its descent*. But his last sentence raises an important question. What did he mean by saying that every other Church must agree with the Church at Rome? Well, in the first place, he said nothing of the sort. We have no complete copy of this work in Greek, as Irenaeus wrote it. This is one of the passages where we must depend upon an awkward Latin translation. What is given above is the Edinburgh translation, which certainly does not seem to make much sense. Here, on the other hand, is a translation from a scholar of the Roman Communion (Berington and Kirk's *Faith of Catholics*, i. 252), which is less favorable to Roman claims and much more accurate: 'For to this Church, on account of more potent principality, it is necessary that every Church (that is, those who are on every side faithful) resort; in which Church ever by those who are on every side has been preserved the tradition which is from the Apostles.'

"'Resort to'? Or 'agree with'? Which is right? *Convenire ad* is ordinary Latin for 'resort to'; *convenire cum* for to 'agree with.' A Latin writer ought to be no more able to confound the two, than an English writer to say, 'I go *to* the Baptist Church every week,' when he means, 'I go *with* the Baptist Church every time.' This Latin version does not say, 'agree with,' but 'resort to.' Probably it says what it means and what Irenaeus meant. But whatever was meant, we must observe the reason for singling out this Church from Churches generally. The argument runs thus: It is by the agreement of all Churches that the faith of Christians is proved to be a revelation from God, for if all agree in reporting one message received from the Lord through the Apostles, then plainly there was a message, and it has not been changed. But it would be tedious to go through a list of hundreds of Churches, showing how the faith came down from the Apostles through a succession of bishops in each. There is one Church in which the agreement of all the Churches is mirrored because there the tradition of the faith has been preserved by witnesses coming from all parts of the world. Christians from all the world over have business that brings them

to the imperial city. They come there and are at unity with the local church. Then in that Church the faith is actually preserved by the testimony of all the Churches of the Christian world at once. Whether Irenaeus meant to say that all Churches had to come visiting the Roman Church on errands, because of that city's secular pre-eminence, or that every Church must necessarily agree with this one, because of a superiority which presently appears to be a superiority of news-gathering, one thing is clear. He says that the Apostolic tradition was preserved in the Roman Church, not by an infallible pope, not by a successor of St. Peter, not by a Vicar of Christ, not by anybody living in Rome at all, but by the Christians from abroad, the faithful on every side. That was why one might use the Roman tradition as being just as good as Catholic tradition, simply because visitors coming in from all quarters made it really to be a Catholic tradition. And this, be it remembered, was not simply a tradition of what Christians had always believed, but of what Jesus Christ had called them to believe." pp. 265 ff.

We have acquainted our readers with what is certainly an interesting book and as a whole, perhaps, the most commendable among the volumes of the "Ten Epochs of Church History" which have hitherto appeared. A. G.

Die biblische Geschichte des Neuen Testaments. *Kurze Auslegung der Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte.* Von G. Stöckhardt, Professor am Concordia Seminar zu St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1898. XIII and 408 pages. Price, \$1.75.

This work is a commentary on the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles in readable form and embodying a synopsis of the four inspired narratives of the life and work of Christ in a continuous description and exposition of the events recorded by the inspired penmen and a wealth of theological comment, applying words and events according as they are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and for comfort and consolation, to make young and old, learned and unlearned readers and hearers wise unto salvation through

faith which is in Christ Jesus. There is in this book no display of exegetical apparatus or of the methodical processes whereby the results here laid down are reached in the theological workshop; but the trained eye will observe on every page the evidences of many years of patient and persistent exegetical labor by a theologian who, under *oratio*, *meditatio*, *tentatio*, has devoted a talented mind and thorough theological learning to the service of the church, of immortal souls whom Christ has purchased with his blood. The reverend author, who is himself familiar with every part and feature of this garden of God, steps, as it were, by the reader's side as an experienced guide, pointing out to him the beauties of the wondrous works of God as they rise into view, pausing here and tarrying there to dwell on what should be more thoroughly understood and impressed upon the memory and taken to heart, pointing out analogies and contrasts, heights and depths, flowers blooming in shadowy places and fruits under foliage, inviting his companion to eat from God's abundance and to drink from the living water-brooks, and setting him an example in both. Having recently perused a number of similar works by various authors, we are all the more impressed with the excellence of this work, and it is our earnest hope and desire that many will reap the benefits which it puts within easy reach of every class of Christian readers. As a specimen we give the chapter on

THE CENTURION OF CAPERNAUM. Matth. 8, 5—13.

(Luke 7, 1—10.)

After a considerable time Jesus came from his pilgrimage through Galilee back to Capernaum. It was then that the centurion applied to him with the request to heal his servant, who lay sick of the palsy, grievously tormented. This centurion was an officer in the Roman military garrison which was stationed in the chief cities of Palestine, and, hence, a heathen. He was, probably, the first officer and most respected man in Capernaum. But he was also in character a nobleman, who had learned to love the Jewish people, the people of God, as the elders of the Jewish congregation of Capernaum testified, and

had built for the Jews at Capernaum the synagogue in which they met for public worship. Luke 7, 3—5. He also took pleasure in the religious services of Israel. He was at heart devoted to the God of Israel, whom he had learned to know during his military service in Palestine. This Roman, then, had even before he had any dealings with Jesus been in his heart and mind a believing Israelite. In his life and conduct, too, he showed fruits of his faith. He had done much good to God's people. As a centurion he maintained strict discipline in the military troops of which he was the commander. His soldiers were accustomed to punctual obedience. He bore heartfelt compassion toward his sick slave. Thus the centurion of Capernaum at once appears as a shining example of faith. He that believes rejoices in God and in the beautiful worships of God. True faith manifests its power in good works, in concern and care for church and school, in conscientious fulfillment of duties and in love toward the neighbor.

By his intercourse with the Jews the centurion had also been made familiar with the messianic hopes of Israel, and since Jesus had exhibited his wonderful works at Capernaum he had probably soon learned to understand that this Jesus was the promised Messiah. And now when the sufferings of his servant grieved him so, he took courage and on his part also prayerfully sought the help of the great helper of Israel. This was faith. "Such faith appears in this, that the centurion, though not a Jew, but a Gentile, yet sends to Jesus the Lord in full confidence that he would not on that account reject him, but would help him as he was able to help." Luther. Faith always clings to the almighty power and the grace of Jesus. Not personally, not directly did the centurion address his petition to Jesus, but through the intercession of the elders of the Jews. Luke 7, 3. He simply causes them to tell Jesus that his servant lay ill at his house. Even a mere statement and complaint taken before the Lord is petition and prayer. The reply which Jesus sends to the centurion by his messengers is, "I will come and heal him." Here, too, he makes his help depending on his will. Jesus' will decides between disease and recovery, death and life. When Jesus now approached the centurion's house, the latter sent friends to him to tell him, "O Lord, trouble not thyself, for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof. Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed." Luke 7, 6. 7. As a poor heathen, as a poor sinful man, he did not deem himself worthy to behold the Lord's face. And yet he persisted in his petition and again sought the favor and help of the Lord for his sick servant. He who has true and living faith ac-

knowledges his own unworthiness and inability, and yet does not doubt that the great God is kindly disposed toward him, and willing to do him good and bless him. He who believes has learned to know what grace is and that the grace of God is intended for the unworthy and undeserving. The centurion reposes unconditional confidence in the word of Jesus. "Speak the word only;" he says, "and my servant shall be healed." He adduces his own example as a parallel in evidence, saying, "For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me; and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it." What he would say is, "If my word, being that of a mere man, is so powerful, how much more powerful, says he to Christ, must be a word spoken by thee." Luther. "This is a most excellent example, that this man can take so firm a stand on the word of Christ." "Do thou, who already hast the word, learn to imitate him in this, for there are the comforting promises that God would be gracious through Jesus, and that we through faith in Jesus shall have forgiveness of sins and eternal life." And one word of Jesus is sufficient unto faith.

The Roman centurion's faith filled the Lord with joyful admiration. He said to the people following him, "Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." This is at the same time a woeful lamentation because of the unbelief of his people, of Israel. The faith of believers is to the Lord a cause of joy and pleasure, and unbelief causes him pain and disappointment. Jesus, as it were, sees in the heathen centurion the firstfruits of the Gentile world, and now beholds in the spirit hosts of Gentiles coming from all directions and sitting down with the pious patriarchs of Israel in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom, the Jews, to whom the kingdom of God was first committed, but who had rejected Christ, the king of Israel, shall be cast out into utter darkness, and shall there weep and gnash their teeth in great torment, anguish and despair. And that shall be the lot of all unbelievers who reject Christ, the only Savior. Hereupon Jesus also by act and deed acknowledged the faith of the centurion: as he had believed so it was done unto him; his servant was healed in the self-same hour. Faith grasps and holds Jesus, the almighty and benevolent helper and Savior, and so takes and receives of Jesus help, comfort, aid, grace, and every good thing. Faith clings to the word of the Lord and so accepts and has all that the word says and confers.

The reader will notice how the two narratives, of St. Matthew and St. Luke, which some commentators have

endeavored to reconcile, while others have found irreconcilable discrepancies between the two, in fact are in no need of reconciliation, there being no real discrepancy, the narrative of St. Luke merely supplementing that of St. Matthew, supplying certain details which, for brevity's sake, St. Matthew has omitted. And thus in many other instances our author exhibits the harmony of the Gospels, helping the reader over what may at first sight appear as insurmountable difficulties. We mention especially the narratives of Christ's resurrection and of his various meetings with his disciples on Easter morning. The above specimen also shows how the author, without losing sight of the progress of the Gospel narrative, succeeds in making profitable use of the word for all the various purposes for which the inspired Scriptures were given, according to the word of the apostle, that whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope. A. G.

Dr. Martin Luthers saemmtliche Schriften, herausgegeben von Dr. Joh. Georg Walch. 14. Band. Vorreden. — *Historische und philologische Schriften. Auslegung des Alten Testaments (Schluss).* St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House. 1898.—XXII pages and 2195 columns. Price, \$4.50.

The Concordia Publishing House has again come out in due time with its annual Christmas offering, a volume of its new quarto edition of Luther's works. The present volume consists of two parts, the first containing Luther's prefaces to the Bible and the various books of the Old and the New Testaments and to a great number of works by himself and others, and a collection of historical and philological writings from the Reformer's busy pen. The second part contains Luther's commentaries on the minor prophets, from Obadiah to Malachi, and thus forms a con-

tinuation of volume VI, which contains the greater part of Luther's commentaries on the prophets. As in earlier volumes, so also in this volume, the reverend Editor has found considerable occasion for textual criticism, and many of the articles and part of the commentaries are here given in a new translation from the original Latin. Among the prefaces the reader will find some of the most exquisite gems of Luther's theology, some of which have even found their way into collections of model readings from German classical literature. The prefaces to the Bible and the several biblical books constitute a manual of theological introduction to the Bible, the careful and repeated perusal of which can not fail to make the study of the Bible all the more highly profitable and enjoyable, not only to the theologian, but also to the general Christian reader. The numerous introductions to the works of contemporary authors teem with theological thought, and bear testimony to the generous heart of the great Reformer, who with never a trace of pride or envy congratulates the church of his day and country to every contribution from pens beside his own, and rejoices in the fruits grown in neighboring and distant gardens as they are offered to God's people. As a specimen we give the preface to the Postil on the Gospels by Antonius Corvinus.

We see and, God help us, feel full well, how highly necessary it is that we diligently and earnestly continue in the pure doctrine of the Holy Gospel and daily promote and propound such doctrine. For as St. Paul faithfully warns us that the devil, our adversary, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour, even so, alas, we daily experience the same before our own eyes and ears. Here many sectarian spirits rush in and devour many, many souls, and there Antichrist, the liar and murderer, is busy and leads many souls to perdition; and even among ourselves there are not a few, who are grown so indolent and secure, that they suppose they could not fail, and have swallowed up hell and all the devils with it. They do not see how, overcome by the devil, they are already deluged and drowned in pride, envy, avarice and unbelief, and filled to the brim and overflowing with all manner of ungratefulness toward God and men, so

that, having, as it were, enough and more than enough of the Gospel, they are taken with the itch in their ears and have become fastidious in their taste for hearing other and new things. They have even learned to be judges and masters over Christ and the Holy Ghost himself.

Such people the devil has eaten up before they have become aware thereof. May God protect us that remain, and help us that we, as St. Peter says, may resist steadfast in the faith. But who will or can faithfully remain steadfast where God's word is not unremittingly in use with speaking and singing and meditating and in many other ways? For where the word is at an end, there faith, which can not be or remain without the word, will also fall away. Therefore, when St. Peter bids us remain steadfast in faith, he would doubtless have us be diligently and steadily occupied with the word, as St. Paul also teaches his disciple, Timothy, saying, Give attendance to reading, and again, Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears. These things are already daily before our eyes and well under way; what dost thou think the end will be?

For these reasons I am highly pleased with these Postils of the estimable Antonius Corvinus, because they keep so close to the Gospel text, brief in words and pure in doctrine, and, indeed, I deem them worthy of being read to the people word for word. For the common people are in need of such clear and short expositions, in order that they may remember something of what they have learned from the Gospel; and it is my desire that some one would go on and prepare in a similar way a brief exposition also of the epistles. If thereafter the lazy preachers will not study or the wiseacres parade their mastery, good and devoted pastors would here have a supply wherefrom they could sufficiently preach to their people the year round, and the churches would be abundantly and well provided throughout the year, so that they had no cause of complaint as though little or nothing were preached to them. Well, then, whoever will hear, may by such service of ours learn all that is needful: and he who will not hear may go his way and have his ears tickled until they smart. Christ our Lord be with us and all that are his own. Amen.¹⁾ Col. 362—365. A. G.

1) We are glad to announce, that a new edition of this rare work, the Postil on the Gospels by Corvinus, is in progress and is being vigorously pushed by our Publishing House. The edition will be in large type, specially adapted for older people.

Populaere Symbolik. *Lutherischer Wegweiser zur Prüfung der verschiedenen Kirchen und religiösen Gemeinschaften. Von Martin Günther, weil. Professor der Theologie am Concordia College zu St. Louis. Dritte, vermehrte Auflage. St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House. 1898. 472 pages. Price, \$2.00.*

Of all the hand-books of Comparative Symbolics by Lutheran authors this work certainly ranks first in point of correctness and completeness, especially in this new edition, prepared by the careful hand of our esteemed colleague, Prof. L. Fürbringer. There is probably no church or sect in all the modern Babel of denominations, transplanted to or sprung from the prolific soil of this Western World, and no perversion of Christian truth nor any form of error advocated in the creeds or other recognized publications of any such sect, which is not here registered and substantiated from such publications and placed into the light of Holy Scriptures and in sharp contrast with the respective Lutheran doctrine. All the vast material massed together here is most judiciously tabulated, and is, besides, covered by a full index and table of contents. The work comprises two parts, the first containing a historical description of the various churches and sects, and the second, a digest of their doctrines with a carefully selected and arranged apparatus of references to the Symbols of the Lutheran church, proof-texts from Holy Scripture, and quotations from or references to the creeds or books of government and discipline of the various denominations. The plan of the work and its execution render the book serviceable not only to the theologian but to every intelligent reader sufficiently familiar with the German language, and the German Lutheran church is singularly blessed by the possession of such a work, which has no equal in the English language. A translation into or reproduction in English would seem to be highly desirable, since English Lutherans are certainly no less in need of a book of this description and excellence than their German brethren.

A. G.

American Lutheran Almanac and Year-book, 1899. *American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburgh, Penn.* 100 pages, paper cover; price, 20 cts., dozen rate, 15 cts.

With sincere pleasure we announce the appearance of this publication of our English sister Synod. The reading matter preceding the statistical material and the addresses of the ministers and school-teachers of the Synodical Conference comprises a "New Year meditation," p. 18, a "Historical Sketch of the English Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri and Other States" with a portrait of the venerable President of that body, pp. 19—22, a "History of Concordia College at Conover, N. C., from 1875—1892" with a full-page engraving of the college buildings, pp. 23—31, an article on "St. John's College, Winfield, Kans.," with engraving, pp. 32—35, and a translation from Jean Paul Richter, "the Two Roads," p. 36. The articles on the Synod and its institutions render this year-book of enduring value and deserving of our cordial recommendation. A. G.

MISCELLANY.

We have been asked to name "the most commendable exegetical work not written in the Latin language." If what is called for is a commentary on all the books of the Bible, we would without hesitation name the so-called *Weimarsche Bibel*; if a commentary on any particular book of the Bible, our choice would be the German edition of Luther's great commentary on Genesis; or of modern commentaries, Philippi on the Epistle to the Romans. Of modern commentaries on all the books of the New Testament we still prefer the first edition of Meyer's "Kritisch-exegetischer Commentar über das Neue Testament."

Correspondence is respectfully solicited on the question, whether our readers are desirous of seeing the publication of a sermon in each issue of the *QUARTERLY* continued, as it was throughout the first and second volumes, or whether they would prefer to have the space which a sermon will occupy devoted to other matters, as in the present issue, in which more special attention is paid to the pulpit under the head of *PRACTICAL THEOLOGY*.

Contributors to the "Quarterly," of whom we hope there may be more in the future than there have been in the past, are requested to use paper of about the size of the *QUARTERLY*, and write on one side only, and no more than ten or twelve lines on a page, when preparing their manuscripts. We make this request partly in the interest of the compositors, who cannot do expeditious work from an ill-prepared manuscript, and partly for our own sake, as the editorial revision of contributions carelessly executed may entail an unjustifiable waste of time, and thus an otherwise creditable article may prove unavailable.
